DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 377	FL 013 423

AUTHOR	Burns, George E.; Olson, Paul
TITLE	Implementation and Politics in French Immersion. Analysis, Discussion and Recommendations on the Social Effects of Implementation in Northeastern Ontario Communities.
INSTITUTION	Ontario Inst. for Studies in Education, Toronto.
PUB DATE	[83]
NOTE	347p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC14 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; *Bilingualism; Elementary Secondary Education; *French; *Immersion Programs; Parent Attitudes; *Political Attitudes; *Program Effectiveness; Second Language Programs; *Social Influences; Socioeconomic Status; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*Ontario

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to assess social and political factors affecting the implementation of French immersion in northern Ontario, Canada. Using a sample of eight boards in Northeastern Ontario communities, data were obtained by interviewing 17 French immersion principals and 52 immersion teachers. Data were also obtained by surveying all immersion parents associated with the 17 immersion schools, as well as immersion students in grades 6, 7, and 8. Analysis of the qualitative and quantitative data revealed that immersion children constitute a de facto elite group of students in the public and separate school systems. Parents' socio-economic status is discussed in the context of program implementation issues. Recommendations are made for improving the implementation of French immersion programs. The study suggests that the failure to develop adequate long-range implementation plans has hindered the smooth operation of these programs internally and has increased hostility needlessly among teachers and community groups external to the programs. These tensions seem to call into question the Canadian federal policy-makers' claims that French immersion as a strategy for achieving bilingualism in education is likely to reduce tensions between Anglophone and Francophone groups. Appendices include letters, questionnaires, bibliographies, and tables. (Author/AMH)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

ED225377

IMPLEMENTATION AND POLITICS IN FRENCH IMMERSION

Analysis, Discussion and Recommendations on the Social Effects of Implementation in Northeastern Ontario Communities

THE ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR
STUDIES IN EDUCATION
MIDNORTHERN CENTRE
1050 LONSDALE AVE.
SUDBURY ONTARIO
P3E 3X4

Principal Investigators

GEORGE E. BURNS

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Midnorthern Field Centre, Sudbury

PAUL OLSON

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Department of Sociology in Education
Toronto

FL013423

This project was funded by The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

The views and findings reflects that of the authors and not necessarily those of the Institute

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
George E. Burns

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE REPORT'S RELATION TO FRENCH IMMERSION

INTRODUCTION:

What makes an educational program work or not work is usually a complex matter. Curricula, tests, evaluations, classrooms, support facilities, and, of course, parents, teachers, and pupils are all necessary ingredients. But even consideration of all these common components of classroom learning is not, in itself, sufficient to guarantee either the best educational policy or optimal pedagogical results. This is because neither the formation and execution of educational policy nor learning as such occurs apart from a social and political context. It is principally to these social factors that this report addresses itself. Historically and in the present, it is in these social contextual waters that "immersion" is itself immersed.

By examining the social context, we believe that we will be able to elaborate one set of relations that will, in turn, allow us to evaluate the consequences of the means used to implement immersion programs. We hope that our findings will complement much of the excellent and necessary work that already has been done on immersion in the areas of curriculum, evaluation, and so on.*

Two central themes recur throughout our report. The first deals with the internal coherence of French Immersion

---

*See Bibliography.

policies--the orchestration of programs, persons, and facilities--and the potential effectiveness of their implementation. The second theme deals with the cultural, political, and economic consequences of operating immersion programs one way as opposed to another. By examining both the internal and contextual aspects of French Immersion policy, we have sought to answer two questions (beyond the basic one of whether or not some children learn French). These are (1) could these programs be made to work better for children in them? and (2) does the effect of any feature of the program threaten rather than help some segment of our community? Collapsing the two questions, we have consistently attempted to evaluate and make recommendations concerning the programs we studied in response to the question: "Are the programs educationally justificable as our best policy?"

Answering this question requires both an understanding of the relationship of performance to intended and achieved goals, and the identification of those for whom and by whom these effects were achieved. Hence, our reporting has assumed a three-tiered structure: first, we try to isolate components of policies and programs in relation to their performance and goals; second, we try to illustrate how implementation of policy has differentially effected persons in the community; and third, we try to make reasonably concrete suggestions about policy we believe would alleviate the problems we identify.

The various constituent groups whose positions are represented and to whom recommendations are made include French Immersion teachers, principals, and parents; directors, senior administrators, and the ministry; non-immersion parents in both the French and English communities; teachers' federations; and, of course, the pupils, whom we all ultimately ought to serve.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The production of any research on social organizations like schools ultimately depends upon joint cooperation of more persons than can be easily acknowledged. Our efforts join the tradition of underacknowledging persons upon whom we implicitly and explicitly relied for the production of our work. Still, we would be remiss if we did not thank at least some friends who have been integral to the production of this work.

First we wish to thank all participants in our study. Specifically these include the Directors of Education of the eight cooperating boards who by their supportive demeanor have illustrated both cooperation and a willingness to examine material in order to improve education in their districts. Similarily we wish to thank principals, teachers, parents and children who completed our questionnaires and interviews. The honesty and decency afforded us was all one could ask. We hope this report returns in small part our debt for your time and assistance.

We wish to thank too, the many people at our own institution who facilitated our work. Particularly we wish to thank Norman Frenette, Michael Fullan, Merrill Swain, Sharon Lapkin, Ross Traub, Raymond Mougeon, Jim Cummings and Peter Evans for assisting us in our initial question designs. We wish to also acknowledge the fine job of typing done by Vivian Crossman and others in translating our handwriting into recognizable English form; to Heather Berkeley for editing parts of the manuscript, to the layout and production staff of OISE

Press for final production assistance, to Carmen Schifellite for coding assistance, and to the librarians at the OISE library, Modern Language Centre and OISE's computer service group.

There are others outside our institution upon whom we relied heavily for technical and statistical advice. Notably, these include persons at the Ontario Ministries of education and Treasury, at Statistics Canada, and at the Calgary Board of Education. Though nameless, we thank you one and all.

We also wish to thank OISE's Research and Development Division for funding this project and to particularly thank Field Development and Dr. Mark Holmes for the continued moral and other support to us when needed.

Finally, we wish to pay special personal thanks to the members of the Burns' family. Reports such as this are presented in silent black and white. Yet this project would not have been possible without more active voice and dialogue to whom the Burns' have been helpful (possible captive) listeners and participants. Your help and love inspired us well beyond the scope of this report.

Our final note is to the reader. We recommend that you take from our report anything that helps you to build opportunities for your families and communities and discard the rest. Ontario is our home and we know you care about its opportunities as we hope we also do. There are few things we can thank you for more than this. Best wishes.

C. Paul Olson George E. Burns

C. Paul Olson George Burns

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction / i

Acknowledgements / iv

Table of Contents / vi

Table of Tables / ix

Table of Figures / xiv

CHAPTER 1: REASONS AND RATIONALES: WHO IS IN FRENCH IMMERSION AND WHY / 1

1.1 The Founding Peoples: The Question of a Bilingual Canada / 1

1.2 Culture For Whom? / 3

1.3 Immersion and the Issues of Cultural Diversity and the Maintenance of Two Language Communities / 6

1.4 Sources of Parental Choices of French Immersion / 15

1.5 The Case for Program Success / 18

1.6 Social Change and the Role of Funding on French Immersion / 21

1.7 The Relationship of Provincial Ministry Funding and Innovation / 21

1.8 Immersion for Whom? Processes Effecting Who Selects French Immersion / 28

1.9 Immersion Parents in Action / 34

1.10.1 A Culturally Diverse Canada: Does French Immersion Really Help Reduce Tensions Between the Founding Peoples and Achieve the "Pluralist Perspective"? / 38

1.10.2 French Immersion and the English Language Community / 47

1.10.3 Tracking and Labelling in French Immersion / 51

1.11.1 Bilingualism for Whom? Public Goals and Private Agendas: Ecology and Possibilities / 57

1.11.2 Bilingualism for Whom? Private and Public Agendas: The English Teachers' Unions and Declining Enrolment / 58

1.11.3 Bilingualism for Whom? Public Versus Private Agendas: The Role of Individual Careers / 62

1.11.4 Immersion for Whom? Public vs Private Agendas: Social and Individual Goals / 63

1.11.5 Immersion for Whom? Lead vs Follow-up Cohorts in French Immersion / 66

1.11.6 Immersion for Whom? Cooperation Between Schools / 68

CHAPTER 2: ASPECTS AND CONTEXTS OF IMPLEMENTING FRENCH IMMERSION / 73

- 2.1 Contextual Conditions / 73
- 2.2 Achievement Studies / 76
- 2.3 The Federal Influence on Achieving Bilingualism in Education / 81
- 2.4 Critical Factors of Implementation / 86
- 2.5 Implementation, Adoption Outcomes and Implementation Process / 104
- 2.6 Implementation as Alterations of Existing Practice / 123
- 2.7 The Need for a Coordinated Strategy and Ongoing Implementation: Principals and Teachers / 132
- 2.8 Student Response to Questionnaire / 152
- 2.9 French Immersion Parent Response to Questionnaire / 158

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY / 180

- 3.1 Introduction: The Limits of Our Interpretation / 180
- 3.2 Principle of Triangulation / 180
- 3.3 Literature Search and Coordination with Other Studies / 181
- 3.4 Using Archival Data / 182
- 3.5 Use of Informants and Pretest / 182
- 3.6 Methods of Entry, Assurances of Confidentiality and Ethical Considerations / 183
- 3.7 Design, Sampling and Administration of Interviews and Questionnaires / 184
- 3.8 Response Rates to Interviews and Questionnaires / 186
- 3.9 Use of Ethnography / 189
- 3.10 Reliability and Validity / 190
- 3.11 Statistical Analysis / 191
- 3.12 Coding and Key Punching / 192
- 3.13.1 Teachers' Demographics / 193
- 3.13.2 Principals' Demographics / 195
- 3.13.3 Parents' Demographics / 199
  - 3.13.3.1 Occupational Status / 199
  - 3.13.3.2 Parents' Educational Levels / 200
  - 3.13.3.3 Parents' Income Levels / 202
  - 3.13.3.4 Parents' Religious Preference / 205
  - 3.13.3.5 Parents' Summary / 205

CHAPTER 4: RECOMMENDATIONS / 206

4.1 Partners in the Advancement of Immersion Education / 206

4.2 The Federal Government / 206

4.3 Boards, Directors, Principals / 207

4.4 Parents / 207

4.5 Teachers and Teachers Federation / 208

4.6 Ministry of Education / 208

4.7 The Role of the Principal / 209

4.8 The Role of the Principal / 210

4.9 The Role of the Classroom Teacher / 212

4.10 The Purpose of In-Service / 214

BIBLIOGRAPHY / 216

APPENDICES

Appendix A Francophone Schools in the Sample / 226

Appendix B Letters of Entry / 236
- B1 Letters to Directors / 237
- B2 Letters to Principal / 240
- B3 Letters to Teachers / 241
- B4 Response Forms for Teachers / 243

Appendix C Questionnaires / 244
- C1 Parent Questionnaire / 245
- C2 Student Questionnaire / 256
- C3 Teacher Questionnaire / 365
- C4 Post Immersion Questionnaire / 297

Appendix D Enrolment Figures showing Enrolment Patterns for French Immersion from a Northern Ontario Board / 308

Appendix E Bibliography from the OISE Bilingual Education Project / 311

Appendix F Table 4.1 / 325
- Table 1.10
- Table 1.12

TABLE OF TABLES

1.1 Frequency Responses by percent to the question: "Does Canada's future depend upon bilingual citizens?" / 9

1.2 Frequency Responses by percent to the question:"Does the presence of French Immersion in Ontario schools show Quebec concern about national unity?" / 10

1.3 Percentage of teacher response to how strongly teachers felt they personally and the principal supported French Immersion programs. / 13

1.4 Percentages of teachers responding to the question of whether they felt their pupils would be deficient in English. / 14a

1.5 Percentage of Frequency of Response to the question: "Do you think Canada is capable of achieving the goals of bringing the language groups together through French Immersion?" / 14

1.6 Percentage of Frequency Responses to the question:"Do parents believe Canada's future depends upon bilingual citizens where there is some ability in both French and English and an awareness of other culture?" / 14

1.7 Percentage of Frequency of Response to the question: "It (French Immersion) would give my child better access to jobs?" / 15

1.8 Percentage of Frequency of Responses to the question:"Does French Immersion help children to regain Francophone identity?" / 16

1.9 Percentage of Frequency of Response to the question: "Teacners, principals, superintendent, trustee, or consultant convinced us of the program's merit?" / 17

1.10 Percentage of Teachers who felt school officials were instrumental in the parental decision to enter French Immersion / 17a

1.11 Percentage of Frequency of Response to the question: "Schools should provide immersion students with opportunities to travel to locations in Quebec where the majority of people speak French?" / 18

1.12 Percentage of student satisfaction with French Immersion / 19a

1.13 Percentage of Responses by Students to the question: "Which of the following educational goals is most important to you?" / 20

1.14 Percentage of Frequency of Response to the question: "How influential would you say the following groups are in effecting changes in French Immersion programs?"/ 29

1.15 Percentage of Frequency of Principal Survey Responses to the question: "Does your school publicize the existence of its French Immersion and bilingual programs with any of the following?" / 35

1.16 Percentage of Frequency of Responses to the question: "Do you think layoffs (caused by French Immersion) are a source of worry among English or French teachers?" / 36

1.17 Percentage of Frequency of Responses by Teachers to the question: "Do you think that non-immersion parents of Anglophones resent or are positive towards French Immersion?" / 37

1.18 Percentage of Responses by Teachers to the question: "How supporting or resentful do you think Francophones within the community are towards immersion programs?" / 37

1.19 Responses by Teachers to the question: "Would you say that this rate of dropout or transfer (in program) is high?" / 51

1.20 Teachers responses to question: "How often is attrition (in program) due to student's behavioural problem?" / 52

1.21 Teachers response to the question: "How often is student attrition due to failure to achieve well in French (language fluency)?" / 52

1.22 Teachers and Parents Religious Preferences / 59

2.1 Percentage Frequency by French Immersion Teachers (N-16) of schools housing immersion to the question: "Who is primarily responsible for determining what teachers will teach (core curriculum) at specific grade levels in French Immersion programs?" / 134

2.2 Percentage Frequency by French Immersion Teachers (N-48) and Principals (N-16) of schools housing immersion to the question: "Are you personally satisfied with the quality of the French Immersion program in the following areas?" / 134

2.3 Percentage responses of Immersion Teachers (N-51) to Specific Barriers / 135

2.4 Percentage Responses of Immersion Principals (N-16) to Specific Barrier / 136

2.5 Percentage Responses of Principals and Teachers to the question: "Does your school have a library/resource centre with materials in French for French Immersion students?" / 138

2.6 Teachers and Principal Response to the question: "Does your school have the services of a French Remedial Teacher available to you?" / 139

2.7 Teacher and Principal Clarification (percentage response) regarding how Improvements are Brough about in Curriculum / 140

2.8 Teacher Satisfaction Regarding Different Aspects of the Immersion Program (percentage responses). / 141

2.9 Principal Satisfaction Regarding Different Aspects of the Immersion Program (percentage responses) / 142

2.10 The Percentage Response of Teachers Regarding French Immersion Beliefs / 143

2.11 The Percentage Responses of Principals and Teachers Regarding Controversial Issues / 144

2.12 The Percentage Response of Principals and Teachers to the question: "How important do you think the French language radio and television is in aiding your French Immersion students master French?" / 145

2.13 The Percentage Response of Principals and Teachers to Questions Concerning Immersion at the Secondary Level / 146

THE ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR
STUDIES IN EDUCATION
NORTHERN CENTRE
1050 LONSDALE AVE.
SUDBURY, ONTARIO
P3B 3X4

2.14 The Percentage Response of Principals and Teachers to the question: "Do you think there will be problems in extending French Immersion into high schools?" / 147

2.15 The Percentage Response of FSL Extended and Immersion Students (Grades 6, 7, & 8) to Motivation Factors / 151

2.16 The Percentage Response of FSL Extended and Immersion Students (Grades 6, 7, & 8) to Program Related Considerations / 153

2.17 The Percentage Response of FSL Extended and Immersion Students (Grades 6, 7, & 8) Regarding Secondary School Language REelated Considerations / 154

2.18 The Percentage Response of FSL Extended and Immersion Students (Grades 6, 7, & 8) Regarding their French Language Subject Plans at the Secondary Level / 155

2.19 The Percentage Response of FSL Extended and Immersion Students Regarding Social Considerations / 156

2.20 Percentage Distribution of Immersion Family's Beliefs Regarding Factors Affecting the Decision to Enrol Child in Immersion / 159

2.21 Percentage Distribution of General Personal Beliefs of Immersion Parents Regarding Immersion / 161

2.22 Percentage Immersion Parent Response regarding: Experiences, Preferences and Perceptions as a result of having a child(ren) in a French Immersion Program / 165

2.23 Percentage Immersion Parent Response regarding How Much Contact French Immersion and Non-Immersion Students Should Have in School Settings / 167

3.1 Completed Interview Schedules by School Code and Status of Respondent / 187

3.2 Numerical Distribution of French Immersion Families (All Grades) and Immersion Students (Grades 6, 7, and 8), and Numerical/Percentage Completed Questionnaires by School / 188

3.3 Marital Status of French Immersion Teachers / 193

3.4 Sex of French Immersion Teachers / 193

3.5 Age Range of French Immersion Teachers / 194

3.6 Principals Religious Preference / 195

3.7 Sex of Principals / 196

3.8 Marital Status of Principals / 196

3.9 Age Ranges for Principals / 197

3.10 Salary Range for Principals / 197

3.11 Education Levels of French Immersion Parents / 201

3.12 Parental Income Levels / 203

3.13 Religious Preference of Parents / 205

TABLE OF FIGURES

A. List of Factors Potentially Affecting Implementation / 96

B. An Inventory of Twelve Factors Affecting Implementation / 103

C. Elements of Implementation: French Second Language Programs / 126

D. Elements of Implementation: Language Related Schooling / 127

E. The Logic of Improving the Implementation of an FSL Extended or Immersion Program / 131

Chapter 1

REASONS AND RATIONALES: WHO IS IN FRENCH IMMERSION AND WHY?

1.1 The Founding Peoples: The Questions of a Bilingual Canada

It is hardly a secret that there has been and continues to be conflict between French and English Canadians and that the tension thus generated is central in the history and identity of the two communities and, indeed, of the nation as a whole. (Laxer, 1979; Wade, 1968). Historical events such as the fall of Quebec in 1759, the Durham Report of 1839, and the conscription crises of 1917 and 1944 constitute some of the most salient points in Canadian history. This conflict has involved more than simple "misunderstandings" or bigotry between the two groups (although there has been plenty of that); rather, what has been--and is--at stake is a cultural conception of what it means to be Canadian. The dimensions of this ongoing cultural conflict led the Pepin-Robarts Task Force on Canadian Unity to conclude in 1979 that "Canada and its constitutional system is in a protracted state of crisis" (the Task Force on Canadian Unity, 1979).

The election of the Parti Quebecois government and the subsequent referendum further emphasized the significance of cultural features, particularly the importance of having *both* French and English as *de facto* as well as *de jure* official languages as a means of insuring Francophone and Quebec identity. But feelings about language also run strong among Anglophones. Responding to suggestions in Prime Minister

Trudeau's proposed constitutional repatriation package, William Davis, Premier of Ontario, has suggested that mandatory installation of dual language rights in Ontario would only serve to foster resentments. Clearly the issue of dual languages in Canada is not a dead issue.

The relationship between the two language and cultural groups is characterized by two prevalent features. The first of these features is that there has been an asymmetry in the usage of the two languages and the relative political power of the groups they represent. This aspect may be explained by some rather obvious historical and economic facts: the English were militarily, economically, and politically the dominant group; nine of the ten provinces are Anglophone; and English is the language of business in most of Canada and North America. Furthermore, forces of cultural assimilation have been notable. The Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism reported that 93% of all immigrants to Canada changing languages adopted English as their language of inversion (Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Book 1: The Official Language, 1967, p. 22). In contrast, nine out of ten persons of French origin retained French as their mother tongue. The second feature of the "language question" in Canada is the association of "French" with Quebec. The stark cultural and political duality of Quebec and the rest of Canada has led some to question whether Canada is actually "one country or two" (Burns, 1979).

No doubt, these characteristics of French-English relations in Canada are redundant to those even minimally familiar with Canadian history. We include this abbreviated review because these cultural features have interesting implications for French Immersion in that they constitute, to a large extent, the cultural and political sensibilities people bring to the programs and, thus, which influence their goals for and expectations of the programs.

1.2 Culture For Whom?

Given the history of relations and the asymmetries between the two language communities, it is easy to conjecture that many persons would see any movement towards a bilingual Canada, and particularly a bilingual Ontario, as a concession to the French. In our ethnographic studies, we found extensive evidence that this perception was held, either implicitly or explicitly, by a wide range of persons. Various non-immersion Anglophone teachers we interviewed would refer to immersion classes as "the French classes" or would suggest that "the French classes" were on the rise at the expense of "the English". While this manner of speaking is understandable since immersion classes do teach French, we shall argue that the rise of "French classes" is critical to unilingual English-speaking teachers since they are functionally excluded from teaching those classes. The French component of the classes therefore has the effect, if not the intent, of cutting English-speaking teachers off from a student population to which they might normally have access. We shall discuss the dynamics of English teachers' relationship to French Immersion more fully later; it is sufficient to note at this point that even a casual content analysis of interviews with Anglophone teachers reveals the strong emphasis in their descriptions of immersion programs on the program's relationship to being "French".

More graphic and more disturbing to those concerned with ethnic and cultural tolerance in Canada is the fact that on at least two distinct occasions the researchers observed French Immersion children referred to by children from conventional English language classes as "frogs". While this evidence of intolerance implicitly learned within the school and community is alarming, what is also interesting is that French Immersion programs are not primarily intended for and, for the most part, do not directly serve the Francophone community. (see Appendix I). French Immersion programs are designed and operated for Anglophone children and families. We shall present evidence later in our report that these children's intended insults are doubly ironic because our analysis of the socio-economic background of immersion pupils (see Table) suggests that, relative to the rest of the Anglophones in their community, they are from the upper socio-economic strata (Blishen, 1967; Harvey, 1974; Pineo & Goyder, 1973; Porter, 1965). This suggests to us that the immersion children and their families belong to what in the past has been archetyped as the bedrock of traditional Anglo-Canadian culture.[1]

Nonetheless, from a subjective perceptual perspective, the association of immersion students with "the French" is intelligible. Immersion classes we observed frequently spoke French to one another, this adherence to français held even when immersion children played in schoolyards and this was almost exclusively true in settings where immersion students were juxtaposed to francophone schools. In Anglophone school settings, French immersion children we observed did speak English when at play, particularly when the setting was "dual track" (where regular English stream students mix with French Immersion children). Such distinctions can also be used as a device to distinguish children from one class from those of another. In one dual track setting in an all-Anglophone school, we observed, for instance, the children from the various classes grouped together playing "King of the Mountain". The contest was held between the "French" (immersion classes) and the "English" (regular English stream classes). Teachers share this way of labelling the classes.

---

[1] Our use of "Anglo-Canadian" here is itself a perceptual archetype. Students in these classes are in fact from various ethnic heritages including French, African and Asian. The statistically prevalent group, however, is white, English-speaking, middle and upper middle socio-economic background children.

For example, various teachers of regular English language classes interviewed made statements such as: "The French get better every year, while the English get worse." What they meant was that each year more of the most gifted of the Anglophone students elect French Immersion, leaving the regular English stream classes with the less gifted students. Such informal identification devices, of course, are not limited to French Immersion and are probably best understood as handy neologism used by students and teachers to distinguish classes. WE do believe, however, that positive identification, status, and solidarity were features of the French Immersion students--features which were not mirrored to the same degree in the other students we observed, including Francophones in Francophone schools.

1.3 Immersion and the Issues of Cultural Diversity and the Maintenance of Two Language Communities

The reasons for implementing a program and the way in which it is actually implemented can lead to two very different things. Likewise, the reasons why a program is proposed and the reasons why parents enroll their children in that program can vary considerably (Warner, 1980). And, finally, the consequences of placing children in a particular program can also turn out to be quite different from those intended. We believe all of these possibilities hold for the French Immersion programs we studied.

If one only reads the official statements of government policy goals, particularly those issued at the federal level describing language learning, one would surmise that cultural diversity and tolerance between the founding peoples is the key issue in French language learning (Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Book II: Education)[1]. This statement has the important caveat that cultural diversity here does not mean just any culture, for Canada is clearly a multicultural society whose ethnic and linguistic communities are much more numerous than the French and the English (Mallay, 1979; Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1970). Insuring language rights and cultural plurality by the mechanism of producing fluently bilingual Canadians is plainly a core intention of federal government policy; and these stated goals are substantively backed in practice by the provision of funds, (one way in which the federal government furthers its goals is by providing transfer grants) to the provinces earmarked for French language teaching. Also, in the 1970's policy funding was directed at instituting bilingualism in the federal civil service and in the armed forces. By 1978, bilingualism priorities were shifting to the so-called youth option; i.e., it was thought desirable that more school children in Canada should have the opportunity to learn the two official languages (Elliott, 1979, p. 3)) primarily for language learning (as opposed to moral education, ethnic histories, multicultural studies, etc. (see Section 2.2). Federal policy makers seem to assume there is a close and unproblematic relationship between the two concepts of tolerance for cultural diversity and bilingualsim.

---

[1] See Appendix A

If we examine the reasons given by parents for entering their children in French Immersion classes, a more complex picture begins to emerge. From a naive reading of policy analysis one might expect that Anglophone parents who had voluntarily entered their children into bilingual immersion programs would be among those Canadians most disposed to seeing bilingualism and biculturalism as central to Canadian unity. One might even expect this concern to be doubly strong since our questionnaire of parents was conducted just before the Parti Quebecois held its referendum on separation (see Appendix Cl). If ever there were a cohort of Canadians for whom one might expect the link between bilingualism and biculturalism to be a salient issue, it would be the parents of French Immersion children in Northern Ontario (where both language groups have substantial numbers). In actual fact, the parents of French Immersion children, judging from their responses to our study, were less adamant about the role of bilingualism in the development of biculturalism and the maintenance of Canadian unity then were their elected officials and civil servants in Ottawa. This is not to suggest that cultural issues were not important to parents. It is clear from comments made to us both verbally and on questionnaires that, for at least some parents, cultural issues were a source of concern. Moreover, this same data revealed that such issues were often a source of intergroup and ethnic tension. However, parents responses to bicultural issues taken as a whole did not give evidence of the universal and imminent alarm one might expect from the tone of "protracted state of crisis" found in the Pepin-Robarts and other reports. For example, when asked to respond to the question, "Canada's Future Depends Upon Bilingual Citizens?" (Table 1.1) an impressive 60% felt this was a factor of only minor or no importance in entering their children into immersion programs.

TABLE 1.1

Frequency Responses by Percent to the Question:
Canada's future depends upon bilingual citizens?

	%
Very Important	17
Important	21
Minor Importance	27
No Importance	33
No Answer/No Response/Missing	2
	100

N = 592

When asked to respond to the more direct proposition, "The presence of French Immersion in Ontario schools shows Quebec we are concerned about Canadian unity" (Table 1.2) 37% agreed; the modal category, nearly 1 in 3 were neutral; and 29% disagreed. In other words, while there was notable support, a full 62% were either indifferent to or disagreed with the proposition, even on the eve of the separatist referendum in Quebec. Robarts and Pepin may be right in suggesting that Canada is undergoing constitutional crisis in the 1970s and early 1980s. They may even be right in suggesting that more bilingual Canadians would reduce cultural tensions and abate this and other future crises.[1] We found little compelling evidence, however, that these were the major considerations which lead Anglophone parents to enter their children into French Immersion in Northern Ontario at the time of our survey.

TABLE 1.2

Frequency Responses by Percent to the Question: The presence of French Immersion in Ontario schools shows Quebec concern about Canadian unity?

	%
Strongly Agree	10
Agree	27
Neutral	33
Disagree	16
Strongly Disagree	13
No Response/Missing	1
	100

N = 592

Our questionning of the subjective link between parental choice of immersion and issues of national and cultural unity found reinforcement in the response of immersion teachers surveyed. French Immersion teachers did appear to be more optimistic than parents in their views about the potential of French Immersion to fulfill its mandate to help bring the two language communities together.

---

[1] However, this pattern did not hold with French Immersion children who from their responses appear to be becoming increasingly sensitive to the unity aspect. For instance, we were told by immersion children that it is a Canadian's right to be bilingual and that Anglophones and Francophones ought to be bilingual as Canadians.

Most of the teachers are themselves Ontarians of French descent. Thirty-five of forty-eight teachers interviewed listed French as their mother tongue. It is conceivable that these teachers have a direct personal interest in bilingualism and immersion programs, and that this interest might influence their views. It is also possible that the observed success rates in French learning in immersion reported by Swain, Lapkin, and others (Barik and Swain, 1978; Barik and Swain, 1977; Genesse, F. 1978) and confirmed in both teacher reports and our own observations and archival checks, may underpin some of the optimism about the program's ability to promote cultural diversity.[1] Many teachers reported on the open-ended portion of questionnaires that their personal skepticism about immersion had been alleviated by observing how well programs worked and children learned. It does not seem unreasonable to speculate that these teachers' change of attitude toward the programs' pedagogical efficacy would make them more willing to see the program as also capable of meeting other goals. In any case, 56.3% of the immersion teachers felt French Immersion would be able to help bring the language communities together (Table 1,5)

---

[1] People may be surprised at how well immersion graduates function in the French language and how committed they may be to bringing the two language groups together. The mid-80s and 90s will prove interesting. These children without a doubt will have their moment in history: they will have an impact on Canada when they assume positions of power.

Immersion teachers' own perception of French Immersion's success was dramatically, universally favourable. Ninety to 92% were very much in favour (the highest rating), and 8% were in favour (the second highest rating); none were indifferent or unfavourable to the programs (see Table 1.3) This pattern of immersion teacher support for their programs held up when questions about the program became more specific. Teachers were fairly uniform in their agreement that French Immersion was the best way for Anglophones to become bilingual. The majority agreed that bilingually educated persons were better educated. Collectively, they disagreed with the propositions that French Immersion was a bad idea either because it made some children different from other children or because it created an elite group.[2] They also disagreed with both the propositions that French Immersion funds could

---

[1] For a more complete reference on achievement effects and findings on bilingualism, see our bibliography and material from the Bilingual Education Project contained in Appendix E.

[2] Single, subjective responses to questionnaires do not, however, guarantee that this is the only valid response--certainly not that this view is shared by all concerned. We found, for instance, that when pressed during an interview, parents would often agree that French Immersion created an elite group and would cite this as a key factor in their decision to place their children in an immersion program.

TABLE 1.3

Percentage of teacher response to how strongly teachers felt they personally and the principal supported French Immersion Programs.

	Very Much In Favour	In Favour	In- different	Somewhat not in favour	Not in Favour	No Response/ Missing	
Personally	91.7	8.3	0	0	0	0	= 100%
Principal Support	68.8	25.0	2.1	4.2	0	0	= 100.1*

*due to round off error

be better spent on French learning in regular English or French school settings and the proposition that the money would be more wisely spent on all subjects. Finally, they emphatically denied that their French Immersion students would be deficient in English language skills (see Appendix F). These propositions represented some of the possible objections to French Immersion suggested to us in our preliminary work by various people in conversation, by media coverage, or by the literature. Clearly immersion teachers believed in the merits of their programs and did not share these worries or accept them as warranted within their frame of reference.

Teachers were less convinced that these socio-cultural goals were reasons for parental choice in entering their children into French Immersion. Fifty five percent felt this was of little or no influence in the parental choice of program (see Table 1.6).

TABLE 1.5

Percentage of Frequency of Responses to the Question: Do you think Canada is capable of achieving the goals of bringing the language groups together through French Immersion?

	%
Very Important	31.3
Can Probably Help	25.0
Minor Consideration	27.1
Not Able to Help	4.2
No Response/Missing	12.5
	100.1%*

N = 48

*due to round off error

TABLE 1.6

Percentage of Frequency of Responses to the Question: Parents believe Canada's future depends upon bilingual citizens where there is some ability in both French and English and an awareness of the other culture?

	%
Very Important	6
Important	33
Minor Importance	40
No Importance	15
No Response/Missing	6
	100

N = 48

TABLE 1.4

Appendix F
Summary table of percentage frequencies of opinions of teachers concerning select statements about French Immersion

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Probably Agree	Neutral	Probably Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response/ Missing
a. French Immersion programs are not a good idea because they make children different from their friends	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	2.1	16.7	75.0	2.1
b. French Immersion programs are not a good idea because they create an elite group	2.1	2.1	2.1	6.3	0.0	33.3	50.0	4.2
c. The money spent on French Immersion would be better spent on improving instruction in French available to students in all English schools	0.0	2.1	2.1	6.3	2.1	37.5	47.9	2.1
d. The money spent on French Immersion would be better spent on improving instruction in French available to students in French language schools	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	6.3	31.3	47.9	8.4
e. The money spent on French Immersion would be better spent on improving instruction in all subjects throughout the school system	0.0	0.0	2.1	2.1	2.1	43.8	41.7	8.4
f. Many children come out of French Immersion programs deficient in English language skills	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	12.5	20.8	54.2	8.4
g. French Immersion is the best way for English speaking children to become truly bilingual	58.3	22.9	4.2	0.0	6.3	2.1	2.1	4.2
h. French Immersion makes school more interesting for children	18.8	29.2	14.6	18.8	6.3	2.1	4.2	6.3
i. The presence of French Immersion in Ontario schools shows Quebec that we are concerned about Canadian Unity	10.4	14.6	20.8	18.8	14.6	4.2	10.4	6.3
j. A bilingual person is a better educated person	31.3	16.7	10.4	12.5	4.2	14.6	8.3	2.1

Note: Variations in row totals from 100% due to round off error.

N = 48

1.4 Sources of Parental Choices of French Immersion

If we are right that the parents do not share the objectives of the policy makers (particularly the federal government policy makers) or that these objectives do not count as their reasons for entering their children in French Immersion, it is reasonable to ask: What are the parents' goals? From our quantitative data and from interviews, it appears that parents have a range of different goals. The two prevalent ones, however, seem to be to provide economic and job opportunities for their children and to give them greater cultural enrichment opportunities.

It would be difficult, indeed, to overestimate the degree to which parents of immersion students are cognizant of the relationship of second language learning of French and jobs in Canada. A remarkable 88% cited better access to jobs as an important consideration in their decision to enter their children in French Immersion (see Table 1.7).

TABLE 1.7

Percentage of Frequency of Responses to the Question: It (French Immersion) would give my child better access to jobs?

	%
Very Important	58
Important	30
Minor	9
No Influence	2
No Response/Missing	1
	100%

N = 592

This pattern, we believe, cannot be written off as "yea-saying" by parents. It contrasts, for example, with the rather negative responses by parents to the question "Canada's future depends upon bilingual citizens?" found in the same section of our questionnaire (see Appendix C) and reported in Table 1.1. Even fewer parents saw the link between French Immersion and regaining Francophone identity.

TABLE 1.8

Percentage of Frequency of Responses to the Question: French Immersion helps children to regain Francophone identity?

	%
Very Important	10
Important	15
Minor	22
No Importance	52
No Response/Missing	1
	100%

N = 592

Neither teachers, principals, nor other school officials were instrumental in selling parents the idea of French Immersion. Only 12% reported that school personnel had had any impact on their decision to enrol their children in French Immersion (see Table 1.9).

TABLL 1.9
Parent Survey
Percentage of Frequency of Responses to the Question: Teachers, principals, superintendent, trustee or consultant convinced us of the program's merit?

	%
Very Important	4
Important	8
Minor	13
No Importance	73
No Response/Missing	2
	100%

N = 592

Teachers also saw the economic motivation of providing their children with better access to jobs as a major factor in parents' decisions to enrol their children in French Immersion. Querried about what they felt influenced the parental decision to enrol their children in immersion, a massive 75% listed access to jobs as being very important. Indeed, in all, a virtually universal 92% felt it was an important consideration (see Table 1.10). Among other parental rationales for program involvement, only learning a second language at 60%, cultural enrichment at 42%, and quality of education at 40%, were listed by teachers as very important factors.

Parents and teachers (Table 1.10) were in agreement in seeing second language usage and cultural enrichment as other important program selection factors. Parents, for instance, saw the opportunity for their child to travel to Quebec (Table 1.11) as more important than either Canada's future (Table 1.1) or French Immersion as a vehicle for illustrating

TABLE 1.10

Percentage Frequencies to Question (teacher survey): How important would you estimate that each of the following was in parents choosing to enrol their children in French Immersion?	Very important consideration	Important Consideration	Minor Consideration	No Influence	No Response/ Missing
a. Belief it would give better access to jobs	75	17	4	4	0
b. Belief it was important to learn another language	60	27	13	0	0
c. Belief that mastery of second language is an important part of education	40	40	15	2	4*
d. It was the only way children can get transported to school	0	0	6	92	2
e. Only way children can eat lunch at school	0	0	0	98	2
f. Immersion is seen as a form of enrichment	42	42	17	0	0*
g. French parents who have lost language or culture wish children to regain Francophone identity	19	35	21	25	0
h. Parents believe Canada's future depends upon bilingual citizens where there is some ability in both French and English and an awareness and appreciation of the other culture	23	46	21	8	2
i. Immersion is seen as the first step in the child being multilingual	6	33	40	15	6
j. Children's friends were in the program	6	19	50	21	4
k. Friends of parent had enrolled their child in the Immersion program	10	31	44	13	2
l. Involvement of parent or student with teacher, principal, superintendent, trustee or consultant who convinced them of the programs merit	2	92	2	0	4
m. Recommendation of a relative in another community who was involved with Immersion program	4	31	44	15	6
n. Other (specify)________________	2	92	2	0	4

N = 48

Ontario's concern to Quebec (Table 2).

TABLE 1.11

Parent Survey

Percentage of Frequency of Responses to the Question: Schools should provide immersion children with opportunities to travel to locations in Quebec where the majority of people speak French?

	%
Strongly Agree	14
Agree	34
Neutral	26
Disagree	17
Strongly Disagree	8
No Response/Missing	1
	100%

N = 592

Teachers, perhaps understandably, saw themselves as a more important factor in the decision to enrol children in immersion than did parents (Table 1.10). The general perceptual fit between the parent and teacher responses was quite close: both saw future access to jobs as primary and cultural enrichment and second language learning as secondary reasons for parental choice. Neither group's response offered overwhelming evidence that the idealized goal of cultural harmony was the reason for children being in French Immersion.

1.5 The Case For Program Success

Sometimes social policy works well in spite of, rather than because of, itself. If those who prepared the funding policy for the federal government failed to influence parents to support their visions of cultural harmony, they nonetheless overwhelmingly achieved their goals in the formation of a motivated and truly bilingual cohort of Anglophones outside Quebec. The raw facts are impressive.

Curriculum and evaluation researchers (Crawford, 1976; Barik and Swain, 1979; and Czilo, 1978) report immersion students achieve higher test scores. The funding for French language learning in Ontario and the number of students enrolled in immersion classes has escalated dramatically (see Section 2.3). Students above the grade six level surveyed in our study reported satisfaction with programs (Table 1.12). They further reported that their satisfaction was such that the goal of being bilingual exceeded that of either knowledge of academic subjects or individual development and self direction as the modal category for their own program learning goals (Table 1.13). Immersion students, as a cohort, generally feel that every student should be made to learn French, that French is a form of enrichment, that Canada's future depends upon bilingualism, and that they take pride in speaking French. They also agree with the propositions that bilingual persons are better educated, that French Immersion makes school more interesting, and that French Immersion aids in bringing French and English together (Table 1.12). If we, as social researchers, were asked on the basis of our quantitative and qualitative data to select the cohort which most supports French Immersion programs, the answer unequivocally would

TABLE 1.12

Percentage of students agreeing to the proposition that:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	No Response/ Missing
22. I think every student should learn French	32.2	36.1	18.0	4.7	8.6	.4
23. French Immersion is a form of enrichment in school	30.5	57.1	4.7	2.6	4.3	.9*
24. Canada's future depends upon bilingual citizens	24.9	43.8	15.0	5.6	10.7	.0
27. I am proud of the fact that I can speak French	70.8	24.5	1.7	1.3	1.7	.0
28. A bilingual person is a better educated person	35.6	30.3	18.9	8.2	6.9	.4*
37. French Immersion makes school more interesting for students	36.5	36.9	12.0	6.0	7.7	.9
41. French Immersion aids in bringing the French and English people together	38.6	36.9	8.2	5.6	9.4	1.3

N = 232

have to be those directly involved in the programs. French Immersion students, plain and simply, believe in the utility of the programs they are in.

TABLE 1.13

Percentage of Responses by Students to the Question: Which of the following educational goals is most important to you?

	%
1. Knowledge of academic subjects	30.5
2. Becoming bilingual	40.3
3. My own individual development and self direction	28.3
4. No Response/Missing	.9
	100.0

N = 231

Evaluating program performance by the gross indicators of (a) pedagogical success as measured by test scores; (b) demographics as measured by increases in volunteers and increases in participation in programs (this being indexed by both the numbers and percentage of pupils in programs in comparison to the total student cohort, and also by numbers in absolute terms); (c) by user satisfaction as evidenced by the self-report measures in our questionnaires; and (d) by teacher self assessment--French Immersion as a program innovation could be fairly judged a resounding success.

1.6 Social Change and the Role of Funding in French Immersion

If the programs are a success, a reasonable question to ask is: how did this occur? The answer, bluntly put, is funding. If federal planners did not succeed in winning the parents (or administrators or provincial ministries) to their idealized goals of the importance of biculturalism for Canadian unity, they certainly succeeded in winning their attention and action through their pocketbooks. We understand this is strong language. We do not mean it to be either accusatory or pejorative. We do firmly believe it is factual. We shall try to justify this conclusion by briefly examining how we perceived the key actors such as the ministry, administrators, and parents were influenced by funding, economic possibilities, and the presence of a growing French Immersion program.

1.7 The Relationship of Provincial Ministry to Funding and Innovation

Under the BNA Act, education is exclusively a provincial matter. Funding for French language learning (both Core French and Immersion), however, has come almost entirely from federal transfer grants to the provinces (CPF, 1981). This is important to recall because the actual push for bilingual education has been supported by federal funds and not by provincial education ministry funds in Ontario (Canadian Parents for French, 1981). Laxer notes that, historically, outside of New Brunswick (and, debatably, Quebec), second language rights have never been a provincial educational priority (Laxer, 1979). The de facto provincial policy has been one of benign neglect.

Accurately understanding the interconnections of financing with government and bureaucratic goals and policies, and tracking these interconnections to discover how innovations are generated in practice, helps us to understand how to make programs both more effective and more (pedagogically and intuitively) sensible. Thus, such understanding may directly facilitate policy recommendations. In addressing the actual sources of change in implementing French Immersion, we would like to advance the thesis that there have been two active constituencies: federal policy makers (effective by providing funds) and the parents of children in the immersion programs (effective by enrolling their children in the programs, and also by being active at the local board and classroom levels). We would also like to argue that the provincial ministry and local administrators have been relatively passive both in initiating policy issues and in program implementation. In other words, policy innovation has been initiated in practice either (1) from the top down (federal to local via the transfer grant route), or (2) from the bottom up (parent groups pressuring for change in the local classroom and community settings). Identifying the relative areas of activity and inactivity in program change has major implications for both recommendations concerning policy organization within the program and recommendations concerning funding structure; it also has implications for our understanding of the political consequences of the programs. We shall explore these effects, but first we will try to present the reasoning behind our claims regarding the forces of change in program innovation.

We mentioned above that the teaching of French language competencies has never been a central ministry goal in Ontario. The results of this may be indexed in several ways. First, the provincial ministry in Ontario still spends little additional, special line-item budget monies of its own on French Immersion, despite the increased pedagogical requirements of the program (*Canadian Parents for French*, 1981; see also Section 2.3. The initial and major push for implementing French was from a federally funded program. Given the federal government's transfer grant policy, there is an obvious and real incentive for the province to allow French Immersion and second language learning. In the fiscal year 1980-81, for instance, the Province of Ontario received $41,000,000 in federal transfer grants for the operation of various French language programs (*Canadian Parents for French*, 1981). Both what the Ontario ministry of education did and what it did not do with these funds are of equal interest: (1) Despite the importance of and the substantial rise of enrollment in French Immersion, the provincial ministry still has not established clear guidelines for its implementation--guidelines which are needed by personnel involved in implementing French Immersion policies.

(Such guidelines do exist, for example, for Core French.) (Ministry of Education, 1973, 1977, 1979, 1980b).

(2) As a result of the lack of guidelines, ministry personnel are often uncertain how to assist teachers. Teachers we interviewed saw the ministry as an important change agent. However, the majority also reported that, as a group, ministry personnel were without either special preparatory training or professional expertise in this area. Furthermore, the ministry offered neither in-service training programs nor a standard of qualifications for teachers. This lack of clear, uniform guidelines was even more pronounced to immersion principals as reported elsewhere (see Olson and Burns, 1981).

(3) The Ministry offers virtually no cost-monitoring of funds received for French language instruction because of the federal transfer grant. The ministry leaves these decisions to the discretion of local boards and directors of education. In effect, the ministry acts almost exclusively as a transfer conduit from the federal to the local level. Thus, the monitoring of funds varies according to the decisions of individual boards. There is no monitoring, for example, of the mix of monies for administration and on-line monies for support facilities, services, and materials for French Immersion learning (or for Core French). It is quite possible in principle (we have done no actual checks and have no hard or soft evidence to believe this is actually the case) that funds obtained from transfer grants for French Immersion could be earmarked for any other programs which

individual directors or boards selected. We shall argue in another section that the implicit logic of the ministry's policy does provide a financial incentive to directors of education and boards to implement (or, at least, not to oppose) French Immersion programs.

(4) The Ministry appears to be unclear as to where the responsibility for supervision of French Immersion lies. In practice, French Immersion is often the responsibility of persons in the ministry offices assigned to work with Franco-Ontarians. This is logical in many respects since these personnel are usually bilingual. It is not logical in the sense that French Immersion is designed to serve Ontario's Anglophone and not Francophone community. French Immersion is a special program which, while clearly creating special needs concerning bilingual supervision, is still a program geared to Ontario's Anglophone community. This uniqueness has not adequately received, we submit, the independent status we believe it deserves. This issue surfaced negatively in our interviews as a source of irritation reported by some immersion teachers. These teachers characteristically expressed the view that neither the French nor English supervisory personnel from the ministry cared about or helped with their programs. Our own observations--if we may introduce them--is that the teachers' impressions did not generally correspond to the intentions and efforts of ministry personnel. Those personnel we observed were

both diligent and concerned about immersion programs. However, the teachers' perceptions are important; they can be understood as the result of the lack of ministry guidelines for the supervision of the implementation of immersion--a lack of which makes the ministry personnel's role both needlessly ambiguous and difficult. Also, even ministry personnel interested in aiding French Immersion teachers are left afloat in terms of their own career interests. Since there are no guidelines to be carried out, any field ministry person who spends his or her time dealing with problems caused by immersion is operating on only the most vague of mandates. As a result, the message implied to ministry personnel is that assisting French Immersion is, at best, a secondary concern given the complexities of these programs, we submit that both clearer, more comprehensive, and active intervention strategies should be established by the ministry to assist immersion teachers.

(5) The ministry has been quite active in assembling and disseminating kits and materials for use in extended and immersion programs to directors of education. However, we found widespread evidence (see Chapter 2) that the materials forwarded to boards in 1979 did not always reach classroom teachers. While instruction materials have been made available for use, they are not always effectively implemented. We have archival

evidence that the ministry had furnished adequate curriculum materials to boards even where teachers noted the need and called for the development of such materials in our interviews (see Section 2.7). This suggests to us that in many boards there are serious bureaucratic problems in the processing, evaluation, and implementation of course curriculum material. While currently the root of these material supply and training problems appears to be at the local level, their persistent recurrence underlines again the need for the ministry to take a more active and conscious role in in-service and other training to support immersion programs. In particular, there is a need to establish mechanisms and funds to insure that teachers are aware of, receive, and are familiar with use of the latest and best curriculum and evaluation materials. This process, in our view, should be assembled, packaged, and sent out with adequate support facilities and mandate to implement on a province-wide basis by the ministry. Establishing standards to insure minimum quality of materials and teaching abilities should be a ministry project and priority.

We believe that the ministry policies of passivity have evolved post facto and not by obstructionist design. Our main goal is not to criticize or second guess the ministry; we do want to suggest that a more direct, active policy role would be pedagogically and politically helpful. We shall try to translate this view into policy recommendations to the ministry (see Chapter 4).

1.8 Immersion For Whom?: Processes Effecting Who Selects French Immersion

Earlier we advanced the thesis that in practice implementation of French Immersion comes from pushes by federal policy makers from above and from parental action from below. Classrooms are, rightly, mainly places of learning. While the dynamics of teacher/pupil interaction are the proper focus of classroom activity, educational policies - for better or worse - are essentially political (Cistone, 1971; MacKinnon, 1960). It is interesting to observe in this regard that, in response to our questions on sources of program change, French Immersion teachers did not see persons logically outside the educational hierarchy of command or persons not directly involved with the program as important change agents (see Table 1.14). Non-immersion parents, for example, were seen as unimportant in this regard. We believe this perceptual focus by teachers emphasizing the dominant position of those directly involved in implementing change comes from an understandable concentration on the day to day micro-dynamics of those forces which effect the classroom

---

[1] Teachers' levels of naivety about the political consequences of their programs is not as great as their responses to program change agents might suggest. French Immersion is a frequent source of coverage in the local media and a topic among teachers and parents in informal settings.

and not from a carefully reasoned or documented analysis of the macro-political ecology in which the programs compete as socio-educational policy (Feir, 1971). To understand this macro-political level (Carlton, 1972) and its indirect effects on learning (Apple, 1979), it is useful to assess the social status and social goals of the parents in the program and to ask how they got there while others did not.

TABLE 1.14

French Immersion Teacher Survey

Percentage of Frequency of Responses to the Question: How influential would you say the following groups are in effecting changes in French Immersion programs?

	Not Influential	Somewhat Influential	Influential	Quite Influential	Extremely Influential	No Response/Missing
a. Parent of French Immersion students.	15	21	10	27	21	6
b. French Immersion students.	35	15	18	15	6	10*
c. French Immersion teachers.	2	13	21	38	23	4*
d. Principal.	2	6	21	44	19	8
e. School board.	2	8	19	27	33	10*
f. Parents of students not in French Immersion programs.	54	21	10	4	2	8*
g. Teachers not teaching French Immersion.	52	23	10	0	0	15
h. Media.	38	27	13	10	0	13*
i. The Ministry of Education.	8	8	23	19	31	10*

N = 48

*Rounds off error

Considered as a group, French Immersion parents come from what, by Northern Ontario standards, are upper socio-economic status backgrounds (see Section 3.13 & 3.3). This is good evidence in the literature from both the United States (Colemen, 1966; Blau and Duncan, 1967; Sewell and Hauser, 1975) and Canada (Harvey, 1974; Laxer, Traub, Wayne, 1974; Crysdale, 1975) that class background effects both student aspirations and their cognitive development and academic performance. The overwhelming evidence suggests that family background is a key explanatory variable in both the child's cognitive and non-cognitive obtainment (Carnoy and Levin, 1976; Jencks, 1972, 1979; Bowles and Gintis, 1976). Given this, we can assume that the parents of students in French Immersion, who belong largely to the upper socio-economic segments of their community play the most important role in their children's academic attainment.

We posit several reasons for this. The first is that middle income families are generally more open to change and innovation (Forcese, 1975). Studies show that upper socio-economic background parents are more prone than their working class counterparts to see program change as positive (Crysdale, 1975). We believe our evidence on parental reasons for program choice (see Table 1.7) also suggests that French Immersion parents, as members of the Canadian middle and upper middle class, are among the first in their community to see the vocational link between second language learning of French and job mobility.

The importance of expanded job opportunities is intensified by other federal policies. In the case of Northern Ontario, its importance is amplified by the problem of out-migration. Northern Ontario has in recent years been a net exporter of population to Southern Ontario and other parts of Canada (O.E.C.,1976). This out-migration has been especially acute among the educated classes (O.E.C., 1976). It is no secret that the number of managerial and white collar opportunities in Northern Ontario is restricted in comparison to the conurban areas of Southern Ontario (Lukas, 1971; O.E.C., 1976). One of the surest paths to middle class status has always been education. In Northern Ontario, one of the surest mechanisms to further enhance the job mobility benefits of one's education (short of having parents who own a successful business) is to be bilingual. This is because government agencies (such as Air Canada, Northern Telecommunications, and various ministries) are among the largest employers of white collar workers in the North -- and they all require bilingualism. Furthermore, the standards set by government policy are often emulated in the private sector. Even among self-employed business persons, bilingual ability increases the range of one's potential clients by as much as 50% (the upper limit of the percentage of Francophones in communities included in our sample). As parents wanting to maximize their children's job opportunities and their access to higher incomes and higher socio-economic status in Northern Ontario, insuring that their children are fully bilingual is one of the best strategies to follow. This reasoning rather than more abstract or idealized goals (as we have tried to illustrate earlier), is behind most parents choice of immersion for their children.

Besides the willingness (and ability) of the largely middle class immersion parents to see the enrichment and job possibilities offered by French Immersion, the way in which the program is advertised also helps to accentuate social class differences between immersion and non-immersion Anglophone parents. Recruitment procedures are generally restricted to a brief set of materials sent home and an annual announcement in the local paper or on the radio (see Table 1.15). Principals (14 of 16) felt material sent home and flyers were the most effective recruitment techniques. The methods of program recruitment, therefore, are largely passive: parents come to the program, school administrators generally do not actively recruit students. As noted earlier (see Table 1.9), immersion parents did not generally see school personnel as instrumental in their choice to enter their child in French Immersion. It does not seem unreasonable to infer from these two sets of information that school boards and school personnel are not active agents in the decision (or awareness) of parents. Likewise, the children are probably not substantially influenced by school officials. The links between French Immersion and job possibilities, cultural opportunities and so on were made independently by the parents themselves.

Certainly, the initiative to enter children in immersion programs is taken by the parents and is not the result of school prodding. Perhaps this is as it should be. However, it must be pointed out that by passively recruiting students and leaving the information about program opportunities to individual judgement, the recruitment procedures have in effect determined the social characteristics of the cohort. The effect - again, not the intent - has been to stratify immersion children from non-immersion children. And this stratification is not only between one group which learns French by one method and another group which learns by a less effective technique (e.g., Core French) or does not learn French at all. The cumulative impact of this passive recruitment is to segregate children in terms of social class, learning opportunities, cultural opportunities, job possibilities, and access to peers. This de facto stratification influences levels of parent involvement in schools and also influences the quality and kind of classmates a student has in each group. The fact that one group, which is largely middle class, learns French in what is generally judged to be the most effective way functionally possible (Lapkin, 1978; Shapson and Kaufman, 1978) while the other group, containing most of Northern Ontario's Anglophone working class, learns a more spotty variety of French or none at all, raises profound social policy questions concerning how these groups will relate to each other and to the Francophone community in the next generation. The consequences of this happenstance approach also raises policy questions concerning equality of opportunity and questions of how publicly funded programs ought to be run. The way French Immersion has developed in Ontario has strong implications for teachers' federations, Franco-Ontarians, school boards, and other community groups. The characteristics of those involved in the program, and those excluded from it, have a subtle influence on the internal nature and opportunity structure of the programs. If one accepts the position that educational policy ought to be a collective as well as an individual responsibility (and, if it is not, why are we using public monies as extra funding for such programs?), then, we believe, planning and accounting for the effects of these programs in relation to our national and social policies is the most educationally defensible policy. The actual effects of these programs ought to be recognized, at the very least, and decisions ought to be made in light of this information. Policy makers ultimately may decide that the current patterns are warranted as policy, but we believe these decisions should be made after a reflection on and reasonable deliberation and debate about the social implications and their consequences.

1.9 Immersion Parents in Action

Immersion parents in Northern Ontario are an impressive group. School officials reported to us that they are quite active in monitoring teacher activity; they attend school

TABLE 1.15

Percentages of Frequency of Principal Survey Responses to the Question:
Does your school publicize the existence of its French Immersion and bilingual programs with any of the following?

		This method is used	This method is not used
a.	Posters	13	88*
b.	Flyers	50	50
c.	Press releases (e.g., TV, radio, other media	81	19
d.	Material sent home with children	81	19
e.	Word of mouth (e.g., teachers and parents tell select individuals they feel would be interested but not) others	37	53
f.	Other (specify) ____________________	13	88*

*Round off error

N = 16

board meetings more often than the average; their views are almost invariably represented in briefs concerning immersion programs. This concern for both the school's and their children's welfare is both laudable and understandable. Their high level of activity, however, results in French Immersion having a high profile at both the school boards and in the local media.

Despite their responses to the question of what effects educational change in immersion programs (see Table 1.14)

French Immersion teachers are aware that their programs are politically "hot" issues in their local communities. This perception came across very strongly in teacher and principal interviews, during which teachers privately expressed their awareness that French Immersion was a political issue among boards, federations, and members of the community. This knowledge comes through in their responses to the specific question of how worried non-immersion English and French teachers were about layoffs created by the growth of French Immersion programs (Table 1.16).

TABLE 1.16

Percentage of Frequency of Responses to the Question: Do you think layoffs (caused by French Immersion) are a source of worry among English or French teachers?

	English Speaking Teachers	French Speaking Teachers
Not worried/indifferent	10.4	33.3
Somewhat worried	33.3	47.9
Very worried	31.3	10.4
Extremely worried	22.9	0.0
No Response/missing	2.1	8.4

N = 48

This awareness that politics entered discussion of immersion programs in their communities also entered immersion teachers' responses to questions about levels of support among non-immersion English and French parents (Table 1.17, 1.18).

TABLE 1.17

Percentage Frequency of Responses by Teachers to the Question: Do you think that non-immersion parents of Anglophones resent or are positive toward immersion programs?

Quite resentful	8.3
Somewhat resentful	33.3
Indifferent	27.1
Somewhat supportive	20.8
Quite supportive	2.1
No response/missing	8.4

N = 48

TABLE 1.18

Percentage Frequency of Responses by Teachers to the Question: How supportive or resentful do you think Francophones within the community are toward immersion programs?

Quite resentful	2.1
Somewhat resentful	16.7
Indifferent	29.2
Somewhat supportive	20.8
Quite supportive	22.9
No response/missing	8.4*

N = 48

Observation of the modal responses proved interesting in each case: the teachers most frequently felt that both groups were somewhat worried. Clearly, those parents whose children were not in immersion were not indifferent to the program. Why might this be so?

---

*Due to round off error

1.10.1 A Culturally Diverse Canada: Does French Immersion Really Help Reduce Tensions Between the Founding Peoples and Achieve the "Pluralist Perspective"?

"Every national social stratification system", writes Curtis, Kuhn and Lambert, "incorporates a cultural component or ideology which describes, explains and justifies it". Certainly the relations between French and English (see Sections 1.1) are such that Ontarians of French heritage have traditionally been relegated to minority and often "second class" status. A widespread perception in the Franco-Ontarian community (if our information is correct) is that the Ontario provincial government's action on the language issue (including French Immersion) has largely been a reaction to Quebec pressure and not a response to the Francophone citizen's welfare. This perception has prevailed in the face of the Minister of Education's attempts to counter it, viz., her citations of growth rates in French learning and clarifications of ministry policies (see Stevenson, 1979). Many Franco-Ontarians felt that the province was responding to federal and Quebec pressure, not to the needs of Franco-Ontarians. Even the provincial government's intervention in Penetanguishene on behalf of Francophone parents' rights, (an issue at the time of our survey) was written off by the Franco-Ontarian educators we talked to as "aimed at Quebec". The issue also surfaced in the informal comments made to us by immersion teachers about the type of textbooks they were required to use. Several complained that they were Quebec-based in content and orientation. For example, they felt the historical explanation for the fall of Quebec in Quebec-based textbooks was biased, that it would be presented differently in the standard history texts approved for English use on Ontario's Circular 14. Not surprisingly, a number of the teachers we interviewed in the French Immersion program were visibly scornful when presented with the proposition: "The presence of French Immersion in Ontario schools shows Quebec that we are concerned about Canadian unity." When asked to explain their response, they expressed the view that Ontario was not concerned with advancing unity but in pacifying Quebec for the sake of trade arrangements.

Francophone educators explanations tended to view Anglophone policies in political and economic terms. Besides their perception of provincial action on bilingualism was an effort to placate Quebec, many Francophones saw the link between bilingualism and jobs. One interviewee produced a graphic, if raw, economic analysis of French Immersion: He stated to us: "Let's fact it, we Franco-Ontarians have had a few good years. Trudeau brought in some policies that let a few of our kids get an even break because they were bilingual. Now you've got all these little English kids in immersion...do you think my kids are going to get a job or a fair break in this province when all those nice upper middle class bilingual English kids come along... you must be nuts."

Our other interviews suggest that this Franco-Ontarian was not alone in his perception of French Immersion. Moreover, there is reason to believe that this perception is objectively based. French Immersion, given federal policies, does mean bilingual persons will have better job opportunities, and that Franco-Ontarians (who have largely been bilingual) and French Immersion graduates may well be "in competition" for them.

Another reason Francophone parents in Ontario worry about immersion programs is that they perceive them as limiting funds otherwise earmarked for Francophone children in French language schools. Although the perception is incorrect (monies for French learning come from federal transfer grants as well as the provincial treasuries), the psychology of the point may be taken as valid. After all, in contrast to the Francophone point of view, many Anglophones see immersion as "programs for the French". A not uncommon comment in our interviews with Anglophone parents was "Why does bilingual always mean French?" or "Aren't the rest of us Canadians, too?" Various other comments were more colourful and even more pointedly anti-Francophone.

The perception that French Immersion "costs" French programs in Francophone schools does not jive especially well with the facts. In times of declining enrolment, economics of immersion programming give rise to educational permutations which do not always conform to the policy plans envisioned and produced at Queen's Park. We found the most exotic instances of these permutations within several Francophone Separate schools. Operating quite nicely within them were what one could effectively describe as French Immersion classes: the children in them were Anglophones; special attention was given to their linguistic and cultural heritage; the language of the classroom instruction was French with some English. Curiously, the teachers and principals in these schools emphatically and repeatedly denied that what they were running were French Immersion classes.

The origins of this public stance were clarified for us privately: the school officials in these Francophone Separate school districts were worried that their largely Francophone ratepayers would rebel at the prospect of having their schools used for the benefit of largely upper middle class Anglophones. Francophone parents (apart from having the usual ethnic predilection toward cultural closure) were worried that the introduction of Anglophone children into their Francophone schools would create strong assimilation forces and hence threaten the acculturation of their children. Principals' and teachers' reports in these schools suggest some real basis for this worry. Some Francophone parents have themselves lost their French language skills and wish to insure the restoration of their language and tradition for their children. The presence in their schools of Anglophone French Immersion children was thus seen as a threat to a major goal.

The response of these Franco-Ontarian schools to this parental pressure was to formally ignore the presence of French Immersion programs in their schools, rigidly adhering to the public posture that they only teach français. Privately, these French school officials will tell you that they welcome French Immersion students because their added numbers make the difference between keeping their schools open or closing them. Declining enrolment thus may be a powerful incentive for the inclusion of French Immersion in some schools. Moreover, the principals reported to us that because they are only "French language" schools, they do not receive the extra funds slotted for the French language instruction of Anglophones[1] (See Appendix A). Thus, that they are willing to forego extra revenues in a time of budget restraint for programs that they actually run underlines how deep these concerns are in the political schemata of these boards.

This public position is also at odds with another aspect of their "French Immersion programs"; the principals conveyed to us privately that they not only need Anglophone French Immersion students to forestall school closure, but they must run the programs in an immersion-type fashion in order to attract them (and their parents) to their school: in a buyer's market the Anglophone's preference is the funding margin between the school's life and death. In our estimation, though, this posture of denial which extends to the program reality itself, viz., French Immersion, is unfortunate. Besides advancing a back door approach to policy implementation, these schools had some of the most pedagogically interesting programs we encountered in our study. Advanced learning in junior kindergarten classes in one school, for example, was effectively blended with French Immersion.

---

[1] We can neither substantiate or repudiate this claim since we did not have access to archival school budget data in these districts. We raise this only because in various other schools studied in our report, either teachers, parents, or principals stated that they did not receive extra funds for immersion when in fact their schools did. Ignorance of funding sources is therefore common.

The reader may have guessed that a second reason principals in Francophone schools are not keen to advertise their de facto French Immersion programs is that their presence is a source of tension with principals and teachers in English language systems. The Anglophone pupils in these schools are effectively siphoned off from English language schools. The effects, as we shall argue later (Jackson, 1978), can often be pronounced.
This competition for students means that Francophone school officials risk the hostility of other school officials as well as their own ratepayers and trustees, if that is, their immersion programs reach high profile. Incentives to publically downplay immersion programs are intense.

In the Francophone schools we observed, the immersion children's achieved performance elicited a schizophrenic response from officials. On the one hand, teachers and school officials welcome immersion children of Anglophone heritage because they are judged to be both highly motivated and capable of doing well both socially and academically. In many respects, they are ideal students and teachers openly speak of the joys of teaching them. But the spectre of having to justify the presence of Anglophone immersion children in Franco-Ontarian schools to Francophone ratepayers is not abated by the Anglo-immersion children's performance. In a number of districts observed, Anglophone immersion children systematically out-performed their Francophone counterparts in other classes in the francophone schools, including in French. As one teacher put it: "Our little English children are more French than the French." This small irony reached the proportions of a minor crisis in one separate school board; virtually all the top prizes in français were won by Anglophones from classes which were, in effect, immersion classes. The prospect of having to publish the awards for proficiency in français in the local paper with almost all Anglophone surnames did little to ameliorate the anxieties of school officials about ratepayers' attitudes toward the presence of Anglophones in their schools.

Inferring from our ethnographic observations and statistical data, the actual reasons for the immersion children's higher performance were fourfold. First, the

French Immersion children in the region at the time of our study were generally of upper socio-economic background and, as such, could be expected to do well in relation to their working class background counterparts. The Franco-Ontarian classes in the Francophone schools we studied drew students from a more heterogeneous population than did the immersion classes. This over-representation of upper socio-economic status children in immersion classes, doubtless, contributed to some of the observed performance variation in the two groups. Secondly, immersion children in their own classroom settings displayed excellent peer solidarity and achievement motivation. Thirdly, immersion children tended to value proficiency in French as a peer as well as school and home goal (see Table 1.12). As previously mentioned, the children spoke to one another in French, even at play and even when unsupervised. Fourth, French Immersion students generally learn the "Parisian" dialect as opposed to the "Canadian" dialect that is learned at home by their Franco-Ontarian counterparts. Teachers, particularly at functions such as contests for proficiency in French, tend to favour the "Parisian" dialect as "correct" French. Immersion children's higher performance in French may be attributable to the fact that the dialect of French they learn and practice is traded at a higher academic currency than is the Canadian variety. This "fashion" in dialects, therefore, may contribute to higher scores as well as socio-familial background and internal classroom practices. This difference in dialects is also interesting in light of the claim advanced by government that bilingualism will aid in reducing tensions and inequalities between Canada's founding peoples. If one dialect of French is taught as "high" French while the other (Canadian-based) dialect is effectively relegated to the status of "low" French, so-called bilingualism becomes a handy mechanism for fostering and reifying status differences between the groups. Differentially rewarding one dialect as opposed to another, when these dialects are systematically used in different ways according to one's group membership, holds the potential of becoming a perverse anti-pygmalian stratification devise for generating a socio-linguistic elite, separated from Anglophones by their bilingualism and from Francophones by their Parisian French. We are not trying to suggest that French Immersion does or will funtion in this way. What we are saying is that the ability, achievement and solidarity structure exhibited by students in French Immersion classes in Northern Ontario is worth considering in this light. The projected consequences of its "success" for other Anglophone and Francophone groups may explain why some in these groups may be reluctant to extol the virtues of immersion programs for Canadian solidarity. What we do know from interviews with French Immersion children is that they enjoy talking to Francophones even though as they also verbally reported to us, "they talk funny" (have a dialect). This is a phenomenon which may warrant further study.

1.10.2 French Immersion and the English Language Community

If Francophone school administrators are coping with a legacy of cultural closure in implementing French Immersion in their schools, if unilingual Anglophones and Francophones are projecting immersion children into the future as Northern Ontario's and Canada's new socio-economic elite, English language school teachers and their representative federations are looking no further than their current pay cheques to form their judgement of immersion programs. For Ontario education is in a protracted state of retrenchment (Jackson, CODE, 1978). Moreover cutbacks differentially effect smaller boards, such as are found in most Northern communities, where schools are relatively smaller to begin with (Lukas, 1971). The transfer of children to French Immersion classes means closing English classes, or schools, which almost surely means teacher layoffs. In extreme cases, closing a school may mean the loss of a central community centre; the bussing of students to considerably further distances; the local board being left to make mortgage payments or pay heating and operating costs on all but empty buildings (which are often hard to sell at value). None of this presents an overly cheerful prospect. The English language teachers we interviewed were often visibly bitter about French Immersion programs.

One of the most common complaints verbally made to us by teachers (again we must guess at how widespread this position acutally is) was that French Immersion not only takes away their students, but leaves them with the "dregs" or poorer students. This complaint may be more than sour grapes. Immersion students in our sample did come from higher socio-economic status families. In addition to the voluntary selection and recruitment procedures, or non-procedures, (see Section 1.4), we found widespread evidence of social and learning labelling by Immersion teachers themselves.

In various schools, for instance, to continue in French Immersion children had to be recommended by teachers, have "sufficient" academic progress, high enough IQ's, and even, in some cases, parents who spoke French. In our supplementary study of a board adjacent to the areas covered in this study, and on the basis of the I.Q. and achievement data available to us, we found that I.Q. levels of French Immersion students were systematically higher than non-immersion students - conforming to southern Ontario findings (see Bibliography) - and actually progressively increased with the number of years in the program. One way to interpret these findings is that French Immersion "made the children progressive smarter" or "increased their I.Q.'s" We believe an alternative explanation is that the higher achievement levels are an artifact of the selection process: as only bright children continue, the mean scores of the cohort rise. The importance of these exclusion patterns is that not all children had equal or even any real access to this form of bilingual learning and enrichment.

Labelling (Becker, 1968) has a "refining" effect on students who remain in the immersion program: not only are such students already over-representative of an upper socio-economic and high academic ability sector by virtue of recruitment procedures but they are further sorted out by teachers and administrators who remove (or recommend) removal of "learning disadvantaged" or "problem" children (see Tables 1.19, 1.20). Teachers, particularly those who deal with a wide spectrum of social, psychological and ability backgrounds in their classrooms, inevitably run into problems and even some failures, but French Immersion teachers are in the politically (and legally) somewhat unique position that they can, more or less, pick and choose their constituency. By a similar logic, teachers and principals can (and occasionally do) make demands upon parents to assist in the immersion child's education--demands which could not be made in conventional classes because principals and teachers are all but obliged to keep the child as their charge, no matter how poorly the child is seen to be doing academically or how frequently disruptive and unmotivated the child may be seen to be by school officials. Children can, of course, be temporarily expelled, but this is almost always seen as a last ditch temporary measure, even by school officials.

Immersion school officials faced with the same general learning or discipline problems may "exile" those children to standard English language classes and schools. One principal in our survey area sends a hierarchical checklist to parents of student qualifications for entry into his school's French Immersion program. Some of these items include the "status" versus "achieved" attributes that parents themselves must meet. For instance, their religious orientation and their own bilingual capacities (regardless of the fact they may desire their children to be bilingual) are used to determine whether their children are suitable for French Immersion. It is also made clear in the memorandum that the principal will not tolerate parents who do not devote adequate time to the child's learning and that the school (upon the recommendation of the teacher) will be the sole arbitrator of whether this mandate has been adequately fulfilled by parents. Such a dictatorial tone may well be viewed as unique to the Ontario situation of the early 1980s, where many principals must grapple with the problem of how to solicit adequate students and parental support, not how to develop procedures by which to turn potential pupils away. Still, this situation may be extreme; variations in the economic realities facing French Immersion programs as well as the English language system(s) as a whole are pronounced and widespread. In many boards, French Immersion is one of the only growing programs in a time of declining enrolment.

1.10.3 Tracking and Labelling in French Immersion

Our informal observations of classrooms and our discussions with teachers suggest that processes of "tracking" (Martell, 1974) and "labelling" (Becker, 1968) are widespread in French Immersion. Teachers themselves appear to disagree with this conclusion: When asked "Would you say that this rate of dropout or transfer (in French Immersion) is high?" the overwhelming majority said no (see Table 1.19).

TABLE 1.19

Responses by teachers to question: "Would you say that this rate of dropout or transfer (in program) is high?"

	%
No	75
Yes	15
Don't know/no answer	10
	100%

N = 48

We believe, however, that students are excluded de facto based upon both class and behavioural characteristics. How this is mediated as a process is interesting. Teachers do not see behaviour or performance as key factors for excluding children from programs. Only 10% for instance felt "behavioural problems" were central to student failure (see Table 1.20).

TABLE 1.20

Teachers responses to question:
"How often is attrition (in program)
due to student's behavioural problem?"

	%
Often	4
Sometimes	6
Rarely	33
Never	35
Other	21
	99%*

N = 48

*due to round off errors

What teachers did find as principle reasons for program attrition were (1) parental transfer from school, and (2) failure of the child to achieve fluency in French (see Table 1.21).

TABLE 1.21

Teacher responses to question:
"How often is student attrition
due to failure to achieve well
in French (language fluency)?"

	%
Often	27
Sometimes	35
Rarely	13
Never	4
Other	21
	100

N = 48

Various teachers suggested informally to us, however, that "language deficiency" was a normatively accepted excuse for problems in the program and that various teachers tended to list any program failure by French Immersion children as being caused by deficiency in "language learning". In other words, French Immersion teachers could eliminate children with general learning or behavioural problems by listing language learning as the source of difficulty. French Immersion teachers, in this respect, may be exempted from having to cope with problem children (as is expected in non-immersion classes) by pointing to the language learning factor.

One might argue that the teachers are "closer" to the actual situation and are therefore better able to measure learning and language disabilities than anyone else. This seems to be a sound argument, except that it is thrown into question by the massive data (Levin, 1972; Stein and Weinrib, 1977; Troike, 1978; Light, 1981) on second language and multilingual learning collected in Europe, the United States, and elsewhere where second language learning is widespread. If the high rates of exclusion from French Immersion in our sample were really only due to the "language learning" difficulties that the teachers report, it would seem a logical inference that there is something about the language learning abilities of Northern Ontario students that is not found in their European counterparts. We are skeptical of the logic implied by such an inference.

We believe a sensible counterhypothesis is that the social and administrative acceptance of the "language learning difficulty" category as a valid excuse for excluding children from the program is a convenient rationalization which allows French Immersion teachers to avoid dealing with the more general learning and behavioural problems that other teachers are legally required to deal with.

These observations found tentative support in our subsequent supplementary study carried out in a board adjacent to those studied in this report. In the latter study (Burns, 1982), I.Q. and achievement as well as survey and ethnographic data were available to the researchers. Two distinct phenomena were evidenced. On an IQ test where the national means and mediums were 100, the lowest IQ encountered in a French Immersion class was 110. Secondly, the mean IQ levels of cohorts increased systematically by grade level in the immersion program. We interpret both these sets of findings to be the result of tracking behavioural problems out of the program and systematically excluding children who "don't fit" either in terms of teachers' ideals of program performance or more general requirements. Such children are grouped in the "language learning difficulty" category.

Our findings on this study are consistent with other findings in the Province of Intario where socio-economic background and IQ data were available. Patricia Crawford, for instance, conducted an evaluation of French Immersion programs for the North York Board of Education and found that French Immersion children had comparatively higher IQ's than their match-paired English class counterparts in kindergarten through Grade 2 (1976). A process report for the Hamilton Board of Education conducted in the Earl Kitchener School found 50% of the French Immersion children came from parents whose fathers had professional backgrounds while the regular English language class children had fathers whose backgrounds were almost exclusively working class blue collar. This Hamilton study reports significantly higher IQ's for the French Immersion cohort (mean IQ 116) versus the English language control group ($\bar{x}=107$). The Hamilton study (H.B.E.R.S., 1976) reports that French Immersion students were "superior in all areas" of the administered ability tests. Both studies also were consistent with our own study in suggesting that jobs and cultural opportunities were the primary factors in why parents entered their children in French Immersion programs.

One difference between other studies and our own subsequent study was that, by looking at longitudinal effects of the program, we could see that it was program exclusion as well as initial parental choice that made the program elite. We would like to suggest that the tracking and labelling processes we have discussed feed upon themselves and that the consequences raise serious policy questions. For exclusion does not occur randomly but systematically against children with lower IQ's; with "poor" fit to the classroom; with working class backgrounds. Hence the effects of tracking feed upon themselves because as working class, behaviour problems, or slow learners are "weeded" out, both the competitiveness and the content demands of the program increase. Children who remain after exclusion processes have occurred tend to be the brightest, best behaved, most motivated and most likely to share, along with their parents, school objectives. Teachers in the program are predictably pleased with the content, progress, and success of the majority of children in the program. The high achievement levels of the bulk of children, however, place strong informal pressure upon them to see "non-achievers" as inappropriate for the program. The effect of the juxtaposition between "achievers" and "non-achievers" creates a perceptual "gap" in teachers' minds about students "not doing well". This justifies and accelerates the tracking process. Undoubtedly, in their quiet confessionals, many teachers might wish they could teach without problem children in their classes, but French Immersion teachers have access to a twin mechanism which enables them to avoid the entire issue: (1) they can label their problems as ensuing from students' "language difficulties" and (2) they can justify their recommendations to transfer such children out of their program by the accumulated evidence of performance variation. What effectively remains when these exclusion processes have been completed is an elite cohort of students as measured by their socio-economic background; their accommodation to the curriculum demands placed upon them; their IQ levels; and their bilingualism.

1.11.1 Bilingualism for Whom? Public Goals and Private Agendas: Ecology and Possibilities

Between idealized social goals and their implementation there are often major stumbling blocks. One common block to smooth policy implementation is formed by the introduction of the innovation itself, which, often unintentionally, changes the ecology of a situation. Such a transformation both creates and truncates various possibilities for the persons implicated in it. We would like to suggest that just this type of ecological transformation occurred when French Immersion was introduced. French Immersion's implementation disrupted the ongoing educational environment in several ways. First, and very noticeably, transferring significant numbers of Anglophone children to bilingual contexts decreased the number of students in unilingual Anglophone schools. The effects of declining enrolment in Ontario are well known (Jackson, 1978) and the further decrease in numbers of students available for "English" classes was bound to intensify them. Displaced teachers and their unions were directly hit. French Immersion, therefore, not only meant more bilingual Anglophone Canadians; it also meant more unemployed English language teachers. The impact was also very accute on smaller boards and schools, especially in Northern Ontario, where geographic area is so great in relation to population density. School systems, already divided between public and separate, and further sub-divided by French and English, now had to deal with "immersion" as but another type of school. This served to escalate the possible combinations of schools and as well to create new possibilities: bilingual teachers (often Franco-Ontarians) could now find positions; largely middle class Anglophone parents could see job and cultural opportunities for their children; in schools themselves new programs mean new positions--program heads, principals, "support" staff, retraining personnel. What these ecological and demographic changes mean in practice is a dramatic change in the dynamics of the political economy of schooling. Thus, the reception of French Immersion was as much influenced by the politics of the situation (viz., the altered structural possibilities for various sectors of the educational community) as it was by pedagogical or policy considerations (viz., the program's potential to teach children French and English).

1.11.2 Bilingualism for Whom? Private and Public Agendas: The English Teachers' Unions and Declining Enrolment

If we were asked on the basis of our studies to designate the strongest opponents of French Immersion, our answer would be the teachers' unions and federations. This opposition is understandable: what French Immersion has done in practice, however unintended, has been, first, to threaten an increase in the number of laid off Anglophone teachers and, second, to threaten union seniority clauses. For even when English speaking teachers have seniority, they are eliminated from the competition for immersion posts not only because of the bilingual requirement but also because of the mandatory demand for Francais. A third consequence, alleged by some teachers, for which we have no substantive data, is that French Immersion teachers are academically less qualified than their senior English language counterparts and are hired solely because of their bilingualism. Even if this is only a perception, and not a reality, it is only sensible to acknowledge it as a source of tension within the school and community.

Among the French Immersion teachers we interviewed, 85% listed Roman Catholic as their religious preference (see Table 1.22).

TABLE 1.22

Teachers' Religious Preference		Parents' Religious Preference	
Protestant	2	Protestant	48
Roman Catholic	85	Roman Catholic	34
Jewish	0	Other	8
Islamic	0	None	6
None	10	No answer/missing	5
Other	2		
No answer	0		101*
	99%*		

N = 48

---

*Variance due to round-off error.

This contrasts sharply, for example, with the religious preference of the parents of immersion students; Protestant was the modal category. Furthermore, from our interviews with immersion teachers, we know that the majority of them are Franco-Ontarians or Francophones from other parts of Canada. It would be naive not to suspect that some non-immersion teachers' views of the program are coloured by ethnic tension and rivalry, especially when jobs are at stake.

What this competition has meant in practical terms is that English language teachers have dominated the unions and have been vocal at local board meetings and in the media, arguing against the expansion of French Immersion. A conflict pattern has emerged in which French Immersion parents are on one side, arguing for extra resources for the programs, while unilingual English language teachers, or their representatives, are on the other, trying to convince boards that funds for French Immersion should be limited or decreased. This adversarial relationship is manifest, for instance, in the positions forwarded by the respective groups in a key Northern Ontario board (TBE, 1980). We suggest that this conflict underscores a common theme in the implementation of French Immersion in Northern Ontario; namely, public policy goals often infringe upon or facilitate private or pressure group goals. Therefore Immersion is favoured or opposed on the basis of private agendas. When these private agendas are translated into "positions" to be presented at public policy forums, the pedagogical debates themselves become surrogates for the advancement of particular private economic and career goals. What benefits one, unfortunately, does not always benefit the other. Although there is a range of opinion within both parent and teacher groups, the former generally argues for expanded programs, with an eye to career and cultural opportunities for their children, while the latter, for the limitation of programs, with an eye to their own career opportunities.

Noting such conflicts is neither pleasant nor politically fashionable in educational circles; however, we believe that their discussion at an analytic level is useful for all parties, for the actualities of the situation, which are not as simple as the adversarial positions might lead one to believe, actually amplify the need for cooperation. Teachers, for example, do benefit from French Immersion via the extra funds that are available for French language learning. Thus, the opposition of teachers' federations to French Immersion does not make sense even in terms of economic self interest. Alternatively, parent groups would be the ultimate beneficiaries if they were to work with teacher federations to establish the retraining opportunities that are necessary if the best and most qualified teachers are to be placed in immersion classrooms. What the actualities of the situation thus imply is that both parents' groups and teachers' federations should be pressuring administrators and boards, as well as the Ministry of Education to plan for the effect of immersion programs. In the absence of such planning, needless conflict has emerged and traumatic job dislocations have occurred. By creating political pressures which override pedagogical concerns, this lack of planning poses the greatest threat to French Immersion. We believe policy implementation is better done through open and calculated discussion.

1.11.3 Bilingualism for Whom? Public Versus Private Agendas: The Role of Individual Careers

French Immersion programs not only open new career possibilities for bilingual teachers and further job prospects for bilingual students, but, as previously noted, new roles for principals, coordinators, and consultants. (New types of schools introduce new administrative needs.) French Immersion has also created new possibilities for those willing and able to retrain as well as those who will do the retraining. However, as (1) the programs are increasing (see Appendix D) and (2) there is almost no retraining mechanism (see Section 2.7), we believe problems will grow along with these new possibilities.

On an equally mundane level, the programs are a source of additional revenue to directors of education whose positions have not always been the longest tenured in the world (Lortie, 1981). One way administrators "build" programs in a limited resource system (to solidify their own positions)is to amass extra funding; and the government transfer system of monies (from the federal to provincial level) for Anglophones learning French results in French Immersion being one potential way to amass such funding. What we are saying is that the directors' willingness to implement French Immersion increases the total monies available to education. Logically, this means more jobs for teachers--something which teachers' federations should keep in mind when assessing the aggregate impact of the program. Moreover, this also means that even if administrators were opposed to the program on pedagogical grounds (we are not implying that they are or would be), there still would be strong financial incentives to carry it out. In this respect, the federal transfer grants have guaranteed the "survival" of the program in the province. For example, an individual principal may not see French Immersion as a high personal or school priority, but a board or director of education is likely to see it as an extra line item and therefore "push" it, despite the principal's lukewarm response.

1.11.4 Immersion for Whom: Public vs. Private Agendas: Social and Individual Goals

As educational researchers evaluating the implementation of French Immersion in Northern Ontario, we feel that one of its most profound effects has been ignored in both the local and national discussions of it thus far. Our observation is that by tracking one stream of upper class, high motivation, high IQ children into a program that all but assures them better job opportunities, while eliminating another stream of children, namely, those of working class backgrounds, from access to this program, a new functional elite is being created. This new social stratification--with its evident class bias--is being accomplished systematically within the structure of the "public" school system.

English language teachers, we have tried to argue, are outspoken in their opposition to French Immersion largely because of a sense of economic self interest. This is what is closest to them; this is what they can see. But the implications for the children who are not in the program are just as real as teacher lay-offs even if at this juncture they are not seen as such. What these implications raise for us are major policy questions. Do we want to create an elite bilingual middle class through public education? Do we want another curriculum for working class or less gifted children? How will this stratification influence the realization of the federal policy goals of reducing tension between language groups and achieving a more tolerant Canada? Are the de facto policy effects in line with our stated educational goals of providing equal opportunity? Will Franco-Ontarians and other francophones welcome more bilingual people or will increased competition from immersion children increase cultural and economic intolerance? The answers to these questions are not simple; but, their consequences are likely to be profound and thus warrant discussion and study.

What is privately advisable may not be the best collective public policy. That truism forms a backdrop to this discussion. It is both right and natural for a parent with a child in the French Immersion program to pressure for the "best" and most enriched French Immersion curriculum and environment. Teachers in the program may also identify easily with these goals. The implementation, however, of one set of ideals may come at the expense of another. For instance, if obtaining "extra" opportunities for French Immersion children means that someone else's child is denied various opportunities, is given poorer access to jobs, and is perhaps bound to become less tolerant of fellow Canadians with whom he/she may be unable to communicate, is not the gain made by aiding one group offset by the loss accrued by the other? Clearly, learning is not a zero sum game; but shouldn't we collectively be concerned with the distribution of opportunities and try to ameliorate systematic exclusion of some groups from something as basic as the learning of one of our national languages? If we are not concerned, what does this say about our claim to provide equal access to all in public education and what does it mean for the type of Canadian society we envision?

What we would like to suggest strongly is that federal and provincial policy makers, boards of education, administrators, teachers, parents, and concerned citizens consider these questions in light of social policy objectives for Canada, pedagogical considerations as well as empirical data on both program performance and the conflict basis of various constituency groups. We believe that it is better to plan effects than to deal with them after the fact. We submit that we are now tracking children and in so doing creating a new educational and linguistic elite. If this is happening, is it something we collectively want?

1.11.5 Immersion for Whom? Lead Versus Follow-up Cohorts in French Immersion

There is an old adage "nothing sells like success". Preliminary data from our follow-up study (Burns, 1981), a Toronto study (TBE, 1981) and ministry figures show that the number of French Immersion classes in lower grades are on the rise. Professor Peter Evans of OISE, for the Sudbury Board of Education, has shown that French Immersion classes, at 1156 in 1981, are projected to rise to 1378 in 1982 and 1539 in 1983 (see Appendix D). In an era of declining enrolment, this increase is doubly significant. Evans's and our own findings reflect provincial trends. We suspect that French Immersion is reaching a much wider cross-section of the student population in terms of SES, IQ and so on, than was true of the lead cohorts. Our informal and preliminary discussions with teachers, school and federation officials suggest this is the case. Moreover, if this second generation is more heterogeneous in its ability range and background, it seems fair to speculate that this will produce the perception that the programs "are not going as well" and the "problems" are on the rise. If our logic is correct, "program failure" per se will not result but rather a more normal distribution of student and learning problems.

Given the likelihood of the expansion of the French Immersion program, the increased heterogeneity of French language students, and the higher incidence of "problems" in class, we believe it crucial that teachers be on their guard against evaluations that are based either on notions of "program failure" or "linguistic deficiency". If our conjectures are right, we believe important policy considerations are at stake: clear guidelines and monitoring procedures should be set down before any child is eliminated from second language opportunities. We can see no reason why children should be excluded from opportunities to become bilingual because of either class roots or learning pace, (where this learning pace is within the limits that would be tolerated in a regular English classroom). We can see strong social arguments why these groups should be included and encouraged to become bilingual, especially in areas like Northern Ontario, where the co-existence of French and English is both a matter of day-to-day experienced reality and not just a paper piece of unpractised national legislation. Genuine "language learning" problems should, of course, be dealt with. We suggest as policy that their presence--or allegation of their presence--should not be used as extradition papers from French Immersion.

Teaching second generation French Immersion students is likely to be pedagogically more difficult. Alternatively, it will offer a greater opportunity to realize our federal goal, namely, a truly bilingual Canada.

1.11.6 Immersion for Whom? Cooperation Between Schools

The effects of declining enrolment, problems around bussing, competition between types of schools (English and French; public and separate) are almost as pronounced at the school level as they are at the teacher level. When we assess this level we again find that politics play a large role in how a program evolves.

Bussing is a potential major issue for immersion programs in Northern Ontario because of the very large geographical areas involved. One suggestion from a consolidated district in one study was to close a small program in one community and bus children to another school district. The problem with this plan was that a French Immersion student living on the eastern side of the district would face a combined round-trip (at the extreme range) of three hundred miles per day. Given the time needed, especially in Northern Ontario winters, for such a journey, the feasibility of this "alternative" is about nil. And, even if parents were willing to subject their children to it, the price of gasoline would make the arrangement questionable. Where schools are located is thus a matter of civic and community interest.

A more important variation on this theme takes the form of deciding which schools will house the French Immersion program. For example, in two districts, the French Immersion program was situated in or transferred to schools that needed extra pupils to remain open; the majority of French Immersion candidates did not live in their proximity. French Immersion is a particularly convenient program for boards that face the problem of school closure. They can argue that they are providing an "extra" service that warrants overturning the generally accepted principle that, where possible, children be kept in their local community schools. Again, the interests of French Immersion parents are often at odds with those of teachers and local school boards.

Most commonly, competition between schools for the extra students offered by French Immersion takes the form of where and how French Immersion should be implemented and extended. This question itself can take several permutations. For instance, we observed debates in various communities over the merits of "dual track" versus "immersion centres". In "dual track" schools, French Immersion classes are housed in a school with regular English classes; in the "immersion centre" approach, French Immersion classes are housed in their own separate school. The dual track model can serve to keep a small English language school open; advocates for it often combine this justification with a "cultural heritage" stance, arguing that the dual track allows French Immersion children to attend the same school as their English language neighbours. French Immersion centres are also justified in terms of keeping schools open, especially in areas where their closure might have political consequences. Advocates for immersion centres stress as well that they allow students to progress at their own rate in learning the French language, while maintaining cultural (and often religious) distance from French language schools. An alternative model to both dual track and immersion centres is placing Anglophone children in French language schools with Francophones. This model is generally supported by three arguments. First, it is cheaper; the French school system exists already and if it can be used for French Immersion, the need for two new sets of French language schools as well as a whole administrative level, is eliminated. Second, French language schools also welcome extra enrolment. (This argument generally is given privately by school officials.) Third, French is best learned in a francophone environment. This last argument is usually countered in the following ways: (1) some francophones oppose the use of their schools by "the English"; (2) others believe that it would be too demanding on the Anglophone children in a pedagogical sense; (3) francophone schools are often under different boards than the Immersion programs. Transferring students could result in "splitting" up families under various board jurisdictions; and (4) many immersion parents argue that while they want their children to be bilingual, they also want them to be "English" and not "French" in terms of their identity. Restated, they welcome opportunities for their children to become "bilingual" but they do not want them to become "bicultural". Where a French Immersion program is housed is therefore a political, economic and cultural issue as much as a pedagogical and physical plant decision. We are frequently asked by parents and administrators which model is "best". This is a difficult question to answer not just because the consequences have political, economic, social and even religious overtones, but because which answer is best in one context may not be in another. Our own bias is that parents ought to be allowed to choose the model they themselves believe is best, where this is at all economically possible. Our rationale is that schools ultimately exist to teach children and to respect the heritage and wishes of families they serve and not to pay off service mortgage debts on schools, make employment for teachers, or be a "football" for civic pride or school board officials.

We know this is often easier said than done. In Northern Ontario, the cost factor due to demographics and geography, may be prohibitive. Virtually every Northern Ontario resident that we knew had accepted foregoing some level of service for the benefits of living in the north. Thus, in some cases, economic constraints are such that even decisions made in earnest will turn out to be onerous. Parents have the right (if not obligation) to demand that their school officials be as sensitive to their concerns as possible; however, we would suggest that everyone would be best served if parents were to recognize that school officials cannot always be miracle workers.

Chapter 2

Aspects and Contexts of Implementing French Immersion

2.1 Contextual Conditions

Within the last decade, French language immersion has become an increasingly popular mode of education among ratepayers in Ontario and throughout most regions in Canada. With more than 435 schools with immersion programs in Canada, of which about half (225) are Ontario, it is evident that immersion is here to stay and will continue to forge its way through existing school structures. While a mere ten years ago immersion programs were adopted with a great deal of skepticism, they have now developed a momentum of their own. This is particularly true in the case of early total French immersion, and early partial French immersion modes of program organization. French second language immersion, it can be said, is in spite of declining enrolment, one of the major growth areas in education.

The fact that immersion education is an educational innovation (we will show what we mean by immersion as an educational innovation in sections 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6) and that it continues to flourish, even under conditions of declining enrolment, makes immersion an interesting area of study. During a period of declining enrolment there are several factors which may potentially hinder the effective development and implementation of educational innovations. This is certainly worth probing in relation to French second language immersion education. For instance, during a period of declining enrolment students become a scarce resource for which educators actively compete. As one would expect, there are many differences in the ways students as resources are treated during a period of institutional growth as opposed to a period of decline. A striking feature of the existing period is that there are notable efforts to increase student retention rates in existing opportunity structures. This is particularly the case of settings which draw from stable or declining populations. Some people have observed that secondary schools and post-secondary institutions (particularly smaller universities and colleges of applied arts and technology) are already in the process of developing strategies to increase overall retention rates. Likewise departments within secondary schools and colleges (some departments more than others) are not only developing strategies to increase retention rates within the department, but are also developing strategies to make programs more attractive to the general intake population. One may well ask--what does this have to do with French immersion? In answering this question, we should perhaps point out that declining enrolment is certainly not a central theme of this study. Declining enrolment has been dealt with more than adequately in CODE, Issues and Questions, and SERP. Our reason for mentioning declining enrolment creates a set of contextual conditions which affect the implementation of educational innovations. While this has been discussed elsewhere in the report we do not wish to underscore the importance of declining enrolment as a factor which has implications for the ongoing development and implementation of programs. In the final analysis the rules of implementation, if left to chance, are likely to be irrational during a period of population decline or stability. As a result, there is a need for a priority setting process (particularly within smaller boards regarding the adoption, development and ongoing development of existing French second language extended immersion programs. The times demand concrete plans and expertise in the management of plans. This is particularly true in relation to French immersion during the present era. The programs are off and running. However, they exist under difficult conditions. The findings in this study not only raise questions concerning factors affecting the implementation of immersion, but the question of the nature and scope of impact that immersion education has on opportunity structures otherwise available within educational systems.

A comprehensive study of French immersion implementation is required. Such a study would necessitate middle range change theory falling between (1) high level abstractions regarding dimensions of immersion programs, being at one moment dependent variables, and at the next, independent variables affecting critical elements of programs making up other opportunity structures for learning, and (2) descriptive data affecting implementation. We do not claim such an attempt here.

In Northern Ontario, as elsewhere in Canada, French Immersion programs have burst existing school structures and have brought new ones into being. The growth of French Immersion programs, especially since the mid seventies, has increased at a tremendous rate. The programs have as a result, drawn considerable attention. As one would expect, there has been a great deal discussed and written about French second language extended and immersion programs. We shall now focus very briefly on some of the more regularly quoted studies.

2.2 Achievement Studies

There is considerable evidence from the literature that the majority of French second language extended immersion studies have evinced a student achievement foci.

It is fairly clear that the acceptance of immersion education as a distinct and legitimate educational enterprise is perhaps due, in no small measure to the achievement studies undertaken by the Bilingual Education Project of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. The dominant studies in this regard (see Barik and Swain, 1975, 1977, 1978a; Swain and Barik, 1976a, 1977; Swain and Barik, 1976b; and Andrew, Lapkin and Swain, 1979a) have contrasted the achievement of immersion students with regular programme students in (1) cognitive ability, French language skills, English language skills, and discipline (subject)specific skills. As pointed out in Andrew, Lapkin and Swain (1980) the purpose of ongoing testing was to determine whether the French language skills of the French immersion pupils were superior to those of the regular programme (comparison) pupils (receiving approximately 40 minutes of French per day), and to monitor the possible detrimental effects of studying in French on the immersion pupils' cognitive ability, English and other academic skills.

The student achievement data suggest that immersion students do extremely well, indeed. Andrew et al (1980) summarize their findings as follows:

> "It is clear that the program has not had any ill effects on cognitive ability...Secondly, the immersion students experienced initial lags in some aspects of English and mathematics up to the grade 3 level. However, from grade 4 onward, the trends have been reversed. Of the four achievement areas tested (English, mathematics, work-study skills and science), twenty-seven distinct test results have been significant since grade 4. (...of these, only two results have been in favour of the comparison group).*

The study concludes that the results clearly indicate that, from grade 4 onward, the immersion students are outperforming the comparison students on several of the English and work-study skills which have been tested.

Comparative data on the achievement of students in the areas of English, work-study skills, mathematics and French in late French immersion programmes (LFIP) and early French immersion programmes (EFIP) are also available. Comparative data (between programme differences) on student achievement in LFIP operated by the Peel, Toronto, Carleton and Ottawa

---

*The study states that of the twenty-seven areas in which immersion and comparison groups were tested, the results for cohort II, grade 4, capitalization and cohort II, grade 6, English Story Completion favoured the comparison group. However, the authors also point out that significance is at the (P .05) level.

Boards of Education are available as well.

According to Andrew, Lapkin and Swain (1980) differences in student achievement in mathematics for students in EFIP and FLIP favour those in late French immersion. Early immersion students however, outperformed late immersion students in tests of French achievement including areas such as listening and reading comprehension, and general ability in French. The study concludes that early immersion and late immersion students should not be combined following grade eight because of between programme differences in French achievement. Although there are a few exceptions, the overall pattern of student performance on tests to assess French ability is similar to grade 8 students enrolled in Peel County, Toronto, Carleton and Ottawa Board of Education late French immersion programmes.

Researchers have also investigated the relationship between school environment (the immersion centre and dual-track school) and student achievement. They also investigated variables indigenous to the school environment which have the potential to influence between setting differences in achievement. Lapkin, Andrew, Harley, Swain and Kamin (1979) found the achievement of the immersion centre students to be statistically significantly different from that of the dual-track students in two areas of French language skills and two areas of English language skills. The achievement of the immersion centre students was higher in French listening and French reading comprehension as well as English vocabulary and English reading.

While it would be inappropriate to generalize on the basis of this one study, the findings lend support to the hypothesis that the immersion centre setting might be more conducive to achievement in a French immersion program than the dual-track school setting. Lapkin et al. suggest that the following factors offer at least partial explanations for differences in achievement:

(1) greater receptive use of French in some contexts in the immersion centres;

(2) slightly more experience as homeroom teachers by the immersion teachers in the centres;

(3) greater satisfaction in the immersion centres with resources available for subjects taught in French;

(4) slightly more favourable staff attitudes towards the immersion program in the immersion centres than in the dual-track schools; and

(5) a possible positive interaction between enhanced second language ability and skills in mother tongue.

Taken as a whole, then, what we have are several descriptive data on the achievement of immersion students. Overall, the various evaluation studies (undertaken by the Bilingual Education Project at OISE suggest that:

- instances of differences in the I.Q. scores between immersion and comparison groups tend to favour the immersion group;

- from grade 4 onward immersion students tend to outperform comparison groups on the different dimensions of English, mathematics, science and work-study skills;

- students in early immersion programmes outperform their late immersion counterparts in tests of French skills;

- immersion students housed in immersion centres tend to outperform (French skills) their immersion counterparts housed in dual-track schools where English is the language of the environment;

- the French ability of students pursuing late immersion programmes may not be sufficient to permit effective subject content in French;

- linguistic opportunity structure in the community is not a major factor in the French ability (achievement) of immersion students.

A list of references regarding the OISE studies are included in Appendix E.

It is apparent, however, that this is not the whole picture of French second language extended and immersion education. For instance, our data suggest that there may be a significant difference between the socio-cultural backgrounds of lead group children and children now entering immersion programs. Lead group children are more notably from high socio-economic backgrounds. In fact, it could be argued that the initial (lead programs) were developed around a very privileged group of students. However, now that French second language programs have become legitimized in the mind of the public there is a greater cross-section of the total student population entering these programs. This raises the question of the extent to which existing practice (in French extended and immersion programs) are (a) appropriate, and (b) effective? We have already alluded to the fact (see Olson and Burns, 1981) that there appears to be a bouncing out phenomenon going on within immersion programs. The instant a child encounters problems, the tendency is to bounce the child from the program.

While this practice may appear to be at first glance, plausible; it is not in fact defensible. It is of the greatest importance to bear in mind that every Canadian child has a right to become bilingual--and a right to remain in programs available for achieving bilingualism in education. While a swift, decisive response to a visible problem may appear to be a solution, we sense a need to improve the implementation of French second language extended and immersion programs towards objectives which address a broad range of student needs. This is basic to the issue of establishing justice in education as a component of the bilingualism field.

This is particularly important in view of the fact that Canada is officially bilingual at the national level, and immersion programs appear to be instrumentally effective in achieving bilingualism, a national policy goal.

2.3 The Federal Influence on Achieving Bilingualism in Education

It appears that there are two significant sources of support for immersion education; the Federal and Provincial Governments. It is not our intent there to analyze the scope of federal and provincial funding and its relation to specific immersion programs. However, we deem it useful to provide perspective to immersion education. Our next few paragraphs focus rather directly on the issue of federal influence on education in general and its role in relation to facilitating bilingualism in education.

The nature and scope of national policy goals in Canadian education is worthy of attention. In its first main stage, Canada would appear to lack a national education policy. In actual fact, education in Canada is clearly within the jurisdiction of individual provincial governments. Section 93 of the British North American Act provides provincial governments with the exclusive right to make laws in relation to education. Constitutional provisions notwithstanding, influence is exercised in specific areas, where assistance, usually financial, is provided by the federal government. In spite of the fact that section 23 of the BNA Act assigns education to the provinces, the federal government has a long history of doling money out with national educational objectives in mind. Significant federal financial involvement has influenced provincial policies and programs in at least three specific areas. Research into various aspects of Canadian education shows that the main stimulus for provincial government commitment to vocational education, various types of educational opportunities at the post-secondary level and French language educational programs has come at different times from the federal government. In this regard, Cameron (1972, pp. 163-178) states that few fiscal transfer arrangements have had as dramatic an impact (at least in Ontario) upon the provision of elementary and secondary education as did the capital grants for vocational school construction under the Federal-Provincial Technical and Vocational Agreement in effect during the early 60's.* The magnitude of federal funding is elaborated upon in considerable detail in a recent documentation of educational policies in Canada undertaken by the government of the Province of Ontario (N.D.). It is worth noting that fiscal transfer of funds in 1973-74 amounted to 401.44 million which was 50% of the eligible operating expenditures for post-secondary education in Ontario. With respect to federal influence on French programs for English speaking students, the province of Ontario has received approximately 18 million dollars annually during the first half of the last decade. Federal funding of French language instruction to non-Francophone students has increased significantly over the course of the last five years. For the fiscal year 1980-81 the federal transfer grant to the Province of Ontario for the promotion of bilingualism in education is estimated at 41 million dollars (Canadian Parents for French, 1981). It is evident that although education is a provincial responsibility under the BNA Act that the federal government is playing a vital role in advancing bilingualism.

---

*Anyone seriously interested in pursuing the issue of the scope of federal influence in vocational objectives in education at the provincial level is urged to read Stamp (1972) who provides an historical overview of this situation in Canada.

In summary, the federal government has institutionalized a variety of fiscal transfer cash payments to the provinces, including Ontario. The transfer grants are geared to specific program objectives. The prupose of transfer grants in areas regarding vocational education, post-secondary education and bilingualism in education is to achieve national policy goals. As pointed out previously, the federal government continues to earmark vast sums of money to achieve language related goals. Bilingualism in education is a program area which continues to receive widespread financial support. As a result, it is an innovation which continues to flourish. What is required however, is a mechanism to ensure the effective use of funds.

It is fair to say that a source of stimulus for increasing bilingualism in Ontario, comes from the federal government. Examples of the various type suggest that in Canada, provincial Ministries of Education are influenced by the federal government to achieve national policy goals. It is particularly noteworthy that the federal government is highly committed to constitutional bilingualism and biculturalism in Canada. As one would expect, the federal government doles out money to provincial ministries of education, Ontario included, to achieve national policy goals related to bilingualism and biculturalism. From the point of view of the present study, policies and programs to foster bilingualism in education exist as policies and programs for achieving national as well as provincial and local goals.

The main thrust for bilingualism in Ontario does not necessarily originate at the provincial level. This may account, at least partially, for some of our findings in the existing study, particularly in relation to factors affecting the implementation of immersion programs.

While the federal government has exercised considerable influence in the adoption of bilingual education policies and programs in education, there is little evidence to suggest that it emerged as a highly conceptualized innovation. As a result, French second language extended immersion programs are adopted and implemented in the context of the "expression of the hopes and aspirations of strong-minded people and their hunches, their determination, inventiveness and enthusiasm" (Stern, 1978). In this regard, immersion education is not to be understood in the context of achievement data. It can only be meaningfully understood in the context of the educational settings in which they appear.

This report, which is based on an examination of bilingual education programs in seventeen schools within eight boards in Northern Ontario, concentrate on internal and external organization factors. Some factors are political, others are pedagogical. The various factors have implications for the manner in which immersion and extended programs get developed and implemented in settings. In some instances settings are hostile. In others, the settings are ambivalent. Rarely is a setting, at least initially, openly receptive.

All in all, parents have been instrumentally effective in fostering widespread diffusion of bilingual education programs in Ontario. However, as our study shows, while funding has been an effective stimulus for these programs, they are being implemented in the face of considerable conflict. The nature and scope of conflicts are in most instances inevitable. In most instances, the general willingness of boards and individual schools to adopt bilingual education programs has been the result of political pressure within the community. Rarely have the main initiatives for adopting and implementing French immersion programs come from within the structures of school systems themselves. School systems being vulnerable to outside influence have, however, adopted a variety of French second language extended and immersion programs. In order to provide conceptual meaning to these programs, we will now proceed to describe the manner in which they exist. Afterwards we will provide a brief account of the setting, and the factors characterizing their implementation.

2.4 Critical Factors of Implementation

This study is concerned with the implementation of French language immersion programs in Northeastern Ontario. The question might be legitimately raised as to what we mean by implementation and what factors are critical to implementing educational innovations? In section 2.4 we deal with the latter, in section 2.4 we deal more specifically with the former.

In this section, we shall clarify what is meant by implementation and shed light on factors likely to affect the implementation of French language bilingual education programs. If educators are to plan the effective implementation of French language immersion programs, a degree of consensus is necessary on (a) what is being attempted and (b) what factors must be addressed to put into practice the essential characteristics of immersion education. At the outset, we would like to state that there tend to be disparities in the way educators use terms such as curriculum implementation and curriculum change. As well, educationists tend to overlook the importance of developing strategies for coping with problems of achieving in practice what is being attempted in theory. Section 2.4 is also concerned more specifically with practical problems that can be reasonably expected to arise when implementing French language immersion programs.

It is apparent that if boards are to achieve the intended outcomes of immersion education, confusion regarding what is being attempted must be minimized. A high degree of clarity is required at the very outset (at the point of program adoption) as to (a) what is being attempted, and (b) how program implementation and student achievement will be assessed. A noticeable feature of numerous educational innovations is that they either fade away shortly after adoption or fall short of their intended objectives.

As well, the focus of change efforts must be directed as much on the organization as on the individual teachers who depend on the organization in their practice (Owens & Steinhoff, 1976). Relationships with schools do not take place haphazardly. What teachers do and how they do it over a continuous period of time is a function of the culture of the school setting of which they are a part. For a major educational innovation to be effectively implemented in a school setting, the culture of the organization must itself be altered. This is particularly true when implementing French immersion.

What is equally intriguing is that for an educational innovation (such as French language immersion) to be effectively implemented--not only must teachers and the school organizational system be the focus of change--the external community must be the focus of change as well. The question of the effects of 'external communities' on the ongoing development and implementation of French language immersion programs is still largely unknown and therefore worthy of further study. However, as Sarason (1971) points out

> "The description of the change process involves, or is based on, the most fundamental assumptions determining three general types of social relationships: those among the professionals within the school setting, those among the professionals and pupils, and those among the professionals, and the different parts of the larger society... Any proposed change...affects and will be affected by all these types of social relationships, and that is what is neither stated nor faced in the modal process of change in the school culture".

As reflected in our discussions in chapters one and two in order to effectively implement French language immersion programs the nature of existing social relationships among different collectivities must be taken into consideration when initiating strategies for advancing implementation. Thus it becomes important to understand immersion education not only in the context of 'intended learning outcomes' for students but also in the context of factors which serve either to impede or enhance implementation. There is nothing unusual in the fact that many of those who compare the internal system (the Ministry of Education, the school board, the school setting, the teacher federations, etc.) and the external community (members of Canada's two charter groups 'anglophones and anglophones', ratepayers, employers, the church, agents of culture, etc.) do not seek change (such as achieving bilingualism in education and institutionalizing bilingualism in the federal civil service and other areas within the labour market) or actively resist it.

The significance of the fact resides in the nature and scope of non-support or active resistance and their implications for implementation. Although attitudes toward this new mode of education (bilingualism in education) may vary, they affect the implementation process. As a result it is vitally important to take sets of social relationships into consideration when planning strategies to cope with problems of implementing French language immersion programs.

Elsewhere (Olson and Burns, 1981) we have discussed in considerable detail some observations of French language immersion programs. As the reader may know, the main interest for bilingualism in education has come from sources external to the school. The need has been created by the federal government and the clamor for it has come from parents. In 1968 the federal government passed the Official Languages Act. The Act recognizes the existence of two linguistic groups and grants French and English an equal status. A few years later, legislation was enacted with a view to institutionalizing bilingualism in the federal service. In fact, the federal government set out to make 25,000 jobs bilingual (Radwanski, 1978). AS we know, second language training programs for adults funded by the federal government to the tune of about 500 mullion a year met with considerable resistance and proved highly unsuccessful. According to Elliott (1979) by 1978, bilingualism priorities were shifting to the so-called "youth option" whereby it was thought desirable that more children in Canada should have the opportunity to learn two official languages.

Though it is generally assumed that the impetus for French language immersion education comes from provincial Ministries of Education or School Boards, it is very doubtful whether this can be shown to be the case. Regarding language policy, it is of the greatest improtance to bear in mind that to this day, the province of Quebec is committed to the principle of unilingual French Quebec and that the other provinces (except for New Brunswick) continue to resist the entrenchment of language rights and the institutionalization of bilingualism at the provincial level. Although Canada as a 'nation state' is officially bilingual, New Brunswick is the only province that is officially bilingual.

The question of the impetus for French language immersion education in Ontario is important to this study on French language immersion program. From the point of view of the present study, if the initiative for French language immersion education comes mainly from the Ministry of Education and School Board Systems, then one could reasonably expect at the Ministerial level the existence of French language immersion curriculum guidelines and a process for monitoring the development and implementation of these programs. At the board level, one could reasonably expect the existence of a long range approach to the development and implementation of this widely accepted mode of education. However, the initiative for French immersion has not come from the Provincial Ministry of Education or School Boards. We agree with Stern (1978) who states that the immersion story is an expression of the hopes and aspirations of strong-minded people and their hunches, their determination, inventiveness and enthusiasm--the initiative has come from parents' groups. As pointed out elsewhere in this study, the federal government has also shown considerable initiative in the promotion of 'bilingualism in education'. The fact that the Ministry of Education and Boards are not the major impetus for French language immersion education has major implications for the manner in which these programs are developed and implemented. Some of the more salient issues will be discussed in sections 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7 of the present report. Examples of the various types will serve to illustrate the Ministry and Boards alike are at most marginally involved in the effective development and implementation of French language immersion programs. We believe it to be likely, that while these programs (the French language immersion programs that we studied) give the illusion of being highly successful, they are in fact experiencing major problems. We are particularly concerned regarding the ad hoc manner in which numerous French language immersion programs are adopted, developed and implemented. It is very doubtful whether improvement can be expected in the absence of the Ministry of Education becoming more directly involved in French language immersion education. The Ministry has a vital role to play in immersion education. However, since this section is more directly concerned with 'determinants of implementation' and to a lesser extent, what we mean by 'implementation', we will now proceed to lay this task to rest. More specifically, we shall now proceed to shed light on factors which appear to affect the implementation of educational innovations; then, we shall clarify what is meant by program implementation.

As pointed out previously, it is apparent that if educators are to achieve the "intended outcomes of immersion education, confusion regarding what is being attempted must be minimized. The nature of the problem is reflected in the following excerpt taken from Lewis Carrolls' Through the Looking Glass.

> "When I use a word Humpty Dumpty said" in a rather scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean...neither more nor less".

The particular approach taken by the authors is that we do not want French language immersion programs to mean whatever individual principals or teachers choose them to mean or for implementation to mean whatever individuals choose it to mean. It is necessary that consensus exist regarding the meaning of a French language immersion program and what is meant by it's implementation. If people are to communicate effectively about French language immersion programs and the effectiveness of implementation strategies, it is necessary to know at the outset what is being attempted and how success will be measured. However, as yet, there is a notable lack of such clarity. As a result, there are tremendous variations in French language immersion programs not only from board to board but from school to school and class to class. As one would expect, success tends to be defined in the context of programs described by individual principals and teachers. In the final analysis, French language immersion programs turn out to be just what individual principals' and teachers' choose them to be and success means just what they "choose it to mean, neither more nor less".

These findings are of course not totally unexpected. A combination of factors, not necessarily attributable to individual teachers or individual principals affect the implementation of educational programs. As mentioned previously, individuals function within the context of an organizational system. For this reason, the focus of concern when attempting to understand the problems of implementing programs in school settings should not be individuals, but the organizational system itself.

To effect needed changes in French language immersion programs, change efforts as Owens and Steinhoff (1977) so adroitly point out, must be directed as much on the organization as on the individual teacher (and in this instance) the individual principal who depend on the organization in their practice. This is one of the themes underpinning the recommendations that we make in sector four of this report.

Research into various aspects of educational change (see Goodlad and Klein, 1970; Sarason, 1971; Smith and Keith, 1971; Gross, Giacquinta and Bernstein, 1971; and Goodlad, 1975) provide documented examples of conditions within organizational systems that appear to adversely affect implementation. For instance, Gross et al, studied an elementary school attempting a major organization change in the role of the teacher. Their analysis of the process of implementation led them to suggest the following reasons why the change effort failed (1) teachers lack of clarity regarding the change, (2) the lack of capability of teachers to perform the new role, (3) unavailability of necessary materials, and (4) the loss of motivation as teachers encountered problems in changing their own practices,

(5) the presence of organizational conditions prior to and during implementation that are incompatible with the innovations, and (6) the influence of management as an important segment of the subordinate's role set. Our own view, is that a number of these determinants weigh heavily on the implementation of French language immersion programs. The scope of effect of some of these factors on the implementation of programs we studied will be elaborated upon in section 2.7.

As we have noted, there are numerous factors which serve to either hinder or enhance the implementation of educational innovations and curriculum. This study does not aim at the articulation of all factors affecting the implementation of French language immersion programs but at a fuller appreciation of factors requiring attention if implementation is to be advanced. The next several paragraphs provide perspective to a range of noteworthy factors.

Fullan and Pomfret (1977) provide perspective to the task at hand when they state that implementation is not simply an extension of planning adoption processes, but that it is a phenomenon in its own right. In an excellent summary of research on curriculum implementation, Fullan and Pomfret (p. 367) conclude that while the complexity of the phenomenon of implementation and the factors that could possible influence it are potentially enormous in number and that while much of the research tends to contain serious conceptual and operational inadequacies--certain common factors are identified frequently in the various studies they analyzed. Their empirical investigation of the literature led to the organization of the various factors which appear to affect implementation into four broad categories, each containing several determinants of implementation. Figure A illustrates the factors (by category) which were empirically derived from the studies analyzed by Fullan and Pomfret.

Figure A. List of Factors Potentially Affecting Implementation

A. Characteristics of the Innovation
   1. Explicitness (what, who, when, how)
   2. Complexity

B. Strategies
   1. In-service training
   2. Resource support (time and materials)
   3. Feedback mechanism
   4. Participation

C. Characteristics of the Adopting Unit
   1. Adoption process
   2. Organizational climate
   3. Environmental support
   4. Demographic factors

D. Characteristics of Macro Sociopolitical Units
   1. Design questions
   2. Incentive system
   3. Evaluation
   4. Political complexity

In education, it is necessary to identify and analyze the factors or determinants of implementation in order to (a) understand why implementation fails or succeeds, and (b) derive implications for how to plan for better implementation. Our own view is that French language immersion education is not only a very complex educational innovation but that it is also politically complex to implement. In this report we are providing objective feedback on a number of factors listed in figure A, through detailed data furnished by our survey.

From the literature, it may be readily seen that there are a number of factors which have to be taken into consideration when developing strategies for coping with implementation. When one realizes that there are factors which because of their presence or absence, either hinder or enhance implementation, and that the principle factors are rarely ones over which classroom teachers have control--it becomes evident that implementation must be viewed in the context of the total organization and the community of which it is a part. What is important here, is recognition of the fact that programs such as French language immersion programs have to be 'managed' into existence. It is not sufficient to adopt French immersion and to permit the programs to evolve into sets of practives involving materials, teaching approaches, and beliefs which because of their very existence give the illusion of being appropriate and effective. However, in the final analysis, the appropriateness of curriculum practices must be examined in relation to principles of sound curriculum organization and effectiveness in the context of student achievement. To deem a program successful on the basis of its existence is to view curriculum simplistically indeed.

Research into various aspects of curriculum implementation has yielded useful information on factors which condition the implementation process. Whether people realize it or not, the implementation of a complex educational innovation (such as a French language immersion program) necessitates interviewing in the cultural setting of the school and in some instances the cultural setting of the community. Prior to the implementation of immersion, schools function in the context programmatic regularities, values, norms, beliefs, and expectations which have a history of their own. The myriad of forces which make up the fabric of school culture either inhibit or enhance implementation. In some instance, the forces at work--while natural--are confusing and self-seeking. As one would expect, the various forces extant within a setting must be known in order to implement French language immersion programs effectively. Thus it becomes important to study the implementation of immersion programs in the context of forces operating on them. These forces exist as important determinants of implementation.

What are the critical factors (determinants) and what is their precise relation to implementation? In school settings, we have action, space and environment. The relationships within the school setting environment do not take place haphazardly--they are not chance relationships no matter how organized, diffuse or disorganized they may appear. The various relationships are structured around sets of expectations which are part of the traditions of the setting.

Implementing French language immersion programs necessitates rearranging relationships and rearranging social structures within the school. It necessitates intervening in the culture of the school and in many instances recreating the culture of the school and schooling.

Propositions are needed by administrators about the impact of factors internal and external to the school upon implementation. They need to know organizational structure, materials, teaching approaches and beliefs are constrained and facilitated by forces extant in settings while some factors are quite obvious, others are not.

An interesting feature of numerous school change projects is the way in which they get introduced into educational settings. Sieber (see Baldridge et al., 1975 describes the situation in the following way:

> "The chaotic character of educational change today has been abetted by crisis-oriented legislation at local and federal levels. Despite the fact that most professional educators, owing to their own crisis orientation, warmly endorse this trend, the outcome is a myriad of educational facts whose sole virtue is often political. The best ideas and practices are easily lost in the stamped".

One gets the impression that the character of numerous French immersion programs has been 'abetted' by crisis oriented policy at local board level and uncritical implementation at the school setting level.

Under what conditions might programs get implemented at the school level? Sarason (1971) sheds light on this situation in writing:

> "Those who are responsible for introducing change into the school culture tend to have no clear conception of the complexity of the process... no organized set of principles that explicitly takes account of the complexity of the setting in its social-psychological and sociological aspects; its usual way of functioning and changing; and its verbalized and unverbalized traditions".

This conception of how change tends to get introduced into educational settings and the expertise that principals have in managing change is not solely based on armchair reflection. It is the result of considerable research in applied settings. Several other studies conclude as well, that all too frequently individuals in positions of responsibility have very little understanding of the complexity of implementing curriculum changes or organizational changes within school settings. As a result, such individuals tend to approach innovation/change with a number of implicit assumptions about what change is and how it is brought about. It is not uncommon for persons in positions of responsibility to view implementation in the context of (1) organization structures, (2) materials, and (3)human resources. These are of course necessary but not sufficient conditions for effective implementation to occur. Teachers are frequently left to their own devices in matters concerning implementation. When this situation exists, those in positions of responsibility are taking a rather simplistic approach to implementation. Such an approach is not defensible. The simple fact that French immersion structures do exist, that students interact with materials, and that teachers who are fluent in

French carry on instruction--is not guarantee that French immersion programs have been effectively implemented or are achieving their intended outcomes. Structures, materials and teachers are instrumentalities (conditions) for implementation; they themselves are not implementation. Implementation occurs when the instrumentalities for implementation are instrumentally effective in achieving "certain desired student learning outcomes". In this regard, implementation is not a product; it is a process. The implementation of a French language immersion program is not a group of students identified as French immersion students or the human and material resources which make up the classroom setting. The particular approach taken by the authors of this report is that implementation is the set of practices (potentially involving materials, teaching approaches, and beliefs) which actually achieve their intended learning outcomes for French language immersion students.

In an educational change projects such as the implementation of French language immersion, it is necessary to (1) reach agreement regarding desired student learning outcomes, (2) conceptualize the program, its key elements and unique practices, and (3) monitor implementation. During this latter phase, it is necessary to analyze the causes of implementation in order to understand why implementation fails or succeeds to derive action strategies for improving implementation. From these discussions, it may be readily be seen that there are several factors which have to be considered when attempting to implement a program such as a French language immersion program.

As mentioned previously, many studies have focussed on the implementation of educational innovations. The paucity of research in the field of educational innovations and curriculum implementation renders anything that we have to say on the subject of factors affecting implementation rather naive. Yet it is important to include this section in our report. It became evident throughout this study that few Boards are coping successfully with factors inhibiting the effective implementation of immersion programs. We found in many instances, that principals did not have a workable conception of French language immersion education or institutional change. As a result, not only are some programs less than what they should be--some are being phased out of existence. One factor which appears to underpin the implementation process is the prepotent tendency of principals to assist teachers access external resources for advancing implementation. The overwhelming impression one gets is that because the French immersion curriculum is viewed as the regular curriculum taught in French, principals are blind to the factors hindering implementation. We are particularly concerned that the conception of French language immersion education and institutional change that principals and others in positions of responsibility have, are incredibly incomplete.

In this section, an attempt has been made to provide perspective to educational innovations and curriculum changes. In the next section, we shall attempt to clarify what we mean by implementation. We shall also endeavour to provide a rich understanding of implementation by discussing it in the context of other concepts which are interactive but conceptually independent.

However, before bringing closure to section 2.4, we would like to make reference to a recent study regarding curriculum implementation. The study (see Fullan and Park, 1981) evolves a list of twelve factors deemed to affect implementation. Figure B illustrates the inventory of factors which are clustered within distinct categories.

Figure B. An Inventory of Twelve Factors Affecting Implementation

---

A. Characteristics of the Innovation or Revision

1. Need for change
2. Clarity, complexity of the change
3. Quality and availability of materials

B. Characteristics at the School System Level

4. History of innovation attempts
5. Expectations and training for principals
6. Teacher input and professional development (in service, technical assistance)
7. Board and community support
8. Time line and monitoring
9. Overload

C. Characteristics at the School Level

10. Principal's actions
11. Teacher/teacher relations and actions

D. Factors External to the School System

12. Role of the Ministry of Education and other educational agencies

A close examination of the factors listed in Figure B will alert principals and others in positions of responsibility as to factors potentially requiring attention. It is worth noting that if any one, two, three or four factors are working against the implementation of a French language immersion program, then the program will not likely achieve its intended outcomes. For instance, if the Ministry of Education is found not to provide leadership regarding French immersion, immersion materials are a scarce resource or of questionable quality, teachers are not provided technical assistance in relation to curriculum organization and curriculum development, and the principal fails to organize and coordinate in-service geared to problems of implementation--one should not expect the program to achieve its intended learning outcomes. Regarding French language immersion programs, it is important to bear in mind the importance of developing an implementation plan which takes into account all twelve factors of implementation appearing in Figure B as well as others discussed in this section of the report.

2.5 Implementation, Adoption, Outcome and Implementation Process

In attending to the theoretical side of implementation, Fullan (1975) provides the conceptual glue for improving implementation practices. The purpose of section 2.5 is to provide a brief overview of what is meant by implementation (in this project, the key concepts are applied to the implementation of French language immersion programs) and to lay out clear logical boundaries for understanding implementation in the context of advancing the implementation of immersion programs.

The following paragraphs then, provide a degree of explicitness to commonly neglected areas which are important to an initial appreciation of the scope of a French immersion implementation project. All too frequently, implementation turns out to be a questionable event, which can at least be partially explained by the tendency to confound certain concepts and their related practices.

The word implementation does not appear to be in common use as a clearly understood concept. As a result, it appears somewhat acceptable (at the present time) for implementation 'to mean just what individuals choose it to mean'. For instance, when boards are asked to list the various French immersion programs that have been implemented within their jurisdiction, one could reasonably expect an inventory of all programs adopted by boards, regardless as to whether or not the programs are achieving their intended objectives. The same is true of responses of principals regarding the implementation of programs at the school setting level. Principals describe whatever program is extant in the school. In other words, board personnel and school based personnel can be reasonably expected to view implementation as a 'product' rather than what it actually is--'a process'.

In education, French immersion programs (the implemented program) is frequently thought of in the context of structures, materials, teachers and students. It's as though--the mere fact that teachers and students exist in some type of learning environment, the program is implemented. This is a false notion of implementation. A program which is not achieving its intended objectives (the formally approved ones), needs ongoing development and implementation. Rarely, is implementation thought of as a process of altering existing practices in order to achieve more effectively, certain desired learning outcomes for students. Yet this is precisely what is required in order to implement a program such as a French language immersion program within a Board or a school setting.

We shall examine key concepts which can serve to provide boundaries for analyzing the status of French language immersion programs in the context of their implementation. The key concepts* are--implementation, adoption, outcome and implementation process.

However, before describing these key concepts and applying them to French language immersion education, we would like to ensure that the readers have a shared understanding of differential FSL programs. The particular approach taken by the writers is that French immersion programs are 'educational innovations'. We view the French immersion programs that we studied in the context of educational innovations being implemented by Boards of Education. These programs are in direct contrast to core French programs, extended French programs, and French language schooling for francophones. The major goals of these programs are different. The terms in common usage for identifying the different types of French as a second language program has been described by Judy Gibson (1979) in a Canadian Parents for French publication in the following way:

---

*The authors do not pretend these concepts to be theirs. The concepts are a function of the creative work of other thinkers. Anyone seriously interested in the study of implementation science is urged to study Fullan (1975), Fullan and Pomfret (1977) and Fullan and Park (1981). Our purpose here is to clarify implementation and to apply its related concepts to French language immersion programs in order to engender a better understanding of these educational innovations.

> "Core French - The traditional program in which French is taught for one period (ten to forty-five minutes) a day, or several times a week. This may begin at any time from Kindergarten to Grade 9. The objective is a basic, beginning knowledge of the language. Also known as "basic" or "exposure" French.
>
> Extended French - An enriched program in which one or two subjects (e.g., math, social studies) are taught with French as the language of instruction in addition to core French. Core French may begin at the same time or precede it by several years. The objective is to give the students working knowledge of French.
>
> Immersion - A program in which French is the language of instruction for all, or almost all, subjects. The objective is a high level of proficiency in French with no accompanying loss in any area of educational development, including first language.
>
> Early Immersion - An immersion program beginning in Kindergarten or Grade 1. For the first few years, all subjects, including reading, are taught in French. English Language Arts is introduced as a subject in Grade 2, 3 or 4, and thereafter the amount of instructional time in English is often increased until a balance between the two languages is reached in the late elementary grades.
>
> Intermediate Immersion - Begins in Grades 3, 4 or 5.

> Late Immersion - Begins at Grade 6 or later, sometimes after a core program, but not necessarily. Often after one or two years of eighty-five to one hundred percent instruction in French the program changes to fifty percent (see post immersion).
>
> Partial Immersion - This may begin as early as Kindergarten or as late as Grade 9. Also known as a "Bilingual Program", half of the subjects are taught in French, the rest in English. Reading is first taught in English.
>
> Post Immersion - A secondary school program in which some subjects are taught in French as maintenance for the elementary immersion program."

While the objective of core French is a "beginning knowledge of French"; extended French - a "working knowledge of French"; the objective for immersion education is a "high level of proficiency in French"--a level associated with bilingualism. The programs that we studied are educational innovations in the sense that they exist as programs for achieving bilingualism in education or in the case of extended programs, a working knowledge of French. While some boards have been involved in French immersion education longer than others, the Ministry regards French immersion to be, in most instances, experimental programs. However, providing the subjects other than French offered as components of extended and immersion courses fall within the rationale of applicable curriculum guidelines, French second language extended and immersion programs are exempted from experimental course approval (Ministry of Education Memorandum, 1977-78:44).

The position of the Ministry regarding French second language extended and immersion programs has been described as follows:

> "In the policy document Teaching and Learning French as a Second Language, issued on April 18, 1977, extended and immersion courses were recognized as valid approaches to the teaching of French as a second language.

and

> "The effectiveness of these learning experiences has been confirmed through extensive research studies. The plans of school boards for all courses in French as a second language are subject to the annual approval by Regional Directors of Education as a condition for the eligibility for grant support."
>
> (Memorandum 1977-78:44)

The authors of this report are well aware of the nature and scope of research studies on extended and immersion programs undertaken in the province of Ontario. An overview of findings have been presented elsewhere in this report. A noticeable feature of the leading studies is that the sample populations studied over the course of the last ten years are not in any way representative of the universe of extended and immersion programs which exist throughout the province, including geographic regions such as Northeastern Ontario and intermediate as well as small scale boards. For instance, according to information given to us by principals of immersion schools and immersion teachers we interviewed--none of their programs have been included in the student achievement oriented studies appearing in the literature.

We are particularly concerned that there is a myth in the province of Ontario regarding the effectiveness of extended and immersion programs. At the present time we know about the effectiveness of some extended and immersion programs in the province of Ontario. For instance, programs conducted by the Carleton, Ottawa, Toronto, Peel, and Elgin County Boards of Education, etc. However, as one would expect, there are not only many differences between the above boards but tremendous differences between the above boards and the various other boards conducting extended and immersion programs throughout the province of Ontario.

It is very important that whatever research is undertaken the results not be generalized beyond the population it represents. It has been evident throughout this project that the results of leading research studies on extended and immersion programs are frequently utilized as a basis for decision making regarding extended and immersion programs and for legitimizing what already exists. It is very doubtful whether the research undertaken to date can be generalized to all extended and immersion programs extant throughout the province of Ontario. In the final analysis, the existing studies may be contributing to a false sense of hope and a false sense of security regarding the effectiveness of extended and immersion education and complacency concerning their implementation.

In the meantime, pending availability of further research, extended and immersion programs are innovations whose development and implementation ought to be monitored closely by the Ministry of Education.

Although French second language extended and immersion programs have been around for more than a decade, they exist as educational innovations which if not effectively developed and implemented, will not achieve their intended outcomes among students enrolled in them. There are several factors which lead us to view the programs we studied as complex educational innovations which rather than being implemented are in the process of being implemented.

For example, the French second language extended and immersion programs we studied were observed to be in a constant state of transition. While the principals (N = 17) and immersion teachers (N = 51) we interviewed had little difficulty describing programs extant in their schools, they were hard pressed to speculate on what the programs might look like within a year or so. Some were not even certain that existing programs (particularly, in relation to late immersion and extended programs) would continue into the future. Based on our observations, French language immersion programs appear to be in a perpetual state of flux. One is never certain that a program will be expanded to the next highest grade level; whether it will exist in a particular school from year to year; whether a board is firmly committed to the concept of dual track schools or French language immersion centres, or both; the particular courses to be offered in English or French on an ongoing basis; whether opportunities for continuing French immersion will be expanded to the secondary school level and if so, the type of program that will be offered; etc. While we cannot generalize beyond the population we studied, it is very doubtful whether many French second language extended and immersion programs exist in the province of Ontario which are based on sound principles of curriculum organization* and/or consideration underpinning their potential effect on subjects and programs not offered as components of extended and immersion programs.

Before attempting to clarify the concept of implementation, it is important to consider carefully what we mean, when we state French immersion programs are educational innovations. In the discussion that follows, the notion of French second language extended and immersion programs as educational innovations is examined.

While facets of the literature suggest that innovations are mere abstractions, numerous sources view innovations as having empirical attributes. Hagan (1962) in keeping with our view that innovations (at least educational innovations such as French language immersion programs) are not merely abstractions; asserts that innovation/change is always in some specific field, involving specific materials or concepts, or relationships to other people. He defines an innovation

---

*By sound curriculum organization the authors mean that the total program conforms to the principles of continuity, sequencing and intregration (See Tyler R. W. *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago; University of Chicago Press, 1950).

as an organization of reality into relationships embodying new mental or esthetic concepts, with new relationships being an improvement over the old. There is ample evidence to believe that this definition applies to French language immersion programs. These programs involve specific materials (which are all too frequently not available), concepts, and relationships. It is indeed clear to us (see Olson and Burns, 1981) that immersion education involves new concepts and relationships. In connection with the latter, it affects relationships between (1) parents and children, (2) children and peers, (3) teachers and students, (4) teachers and colleagues, (5) principals and teachers, (6) the school and the community, and (7) francophones and anglophones, etc.

Rothman (1976), states that an innovation is any program, technique, or activity perceived as new by a population, group or organization. French language immersion programs are certainly perceived as modes of education that are new. In fact, there are numerous ratepayers (according to data that we collected) who are not even aware of the existence of these programs. Francophones and anglophones alike perceive bilingual education programs as being a new phenomenon in education. Elsewhere in this report we discuss concerns that francophones have about these new modes of achieving bilingualism.

Barnett (1953) also provides perspective to the meaning of the application of the word innovation. He emphasizes the fact that an innovation is any thought, behaviour, or thing that is new because of its qualitatively different form. He emphasizes as well that these qualitative differences can be measured objectively. In education, it is important that those in positions of responsibility be cognizant of the qualitative differences among programs described by Gibson and the relation between these differences and student learning outcomes.

Finally, Mohr (1963) suggests that an innovation is the successful introduction into an applied situation of means or ends new to the situation. While Hagan, Rothman, Barnett and Mohr render descriptions which provide perspective to our notion of French second language and immersion programs as educational innovations, we are particularly impressed by the latter definition. The programs studied by the authors have been successfully introduced into school settings in the sense that they are indeed, extant in the setting. We do not mean here that the programs have been successfully introduced in the sense of achieving their intended outcomes. We mean success in the context of their presence within school settings. The programs are not only new means for achieving second language competency--they are geared to achieving new ends (bilingualism) in education.

The authors believe that it is important to study immersion programs in terms of means or ends which have a dynamic of their own. All too frequently in education, programs are perceived as a means to an end. This conception of educational programs leads people to believe that if a specific type of program is implemented--a certain set of ends will be achieved and the achievement is evidence of implementation. This is a rather simplistic view of innovation and implementation. In education, the ends keep shifting--this has the effect of creating the need for new means or altered practices. The concept of altered practice will be discussed in considerable detail in our ensuing discussions on implementation. Suffice it to point out here that the precise relationship between means and ends in education while giving the appearance of being clear, is in actual fact rather illusive. The authors believe this to be particularly true with respect to French second language extended and immersion programs.

Because of the complexity and difficulty of achieving bilingualism in education, French second language extended and immersion examined during the course of this study were found to be in a constant state of dynamic flux. Although the programs we examined were in effect adopted and introduced into applied settings; they were found to be experiencing considerable problems of development and implementation. We do not regard this to be an alarming situation or in fact a very revealing finding. That these programs are experiencing problems of implementation should not cause any great concern. What is required is the development of strategies for coping with problems of curriculum development and program implementation.

As pointed out previously, we do not regard the programs examined in this project to be fully developed or implemented. The distinction between (1) development and implementation (see Burns, 1979) and (2) programs in the process of being implemented as opposed to implemented program permits us to make recommendations for advancing the development and implementation of French second language extended and immersion programs. It is our view that programs such as the ones we have examined are never completely implemented. They exist in the context of being in the process of being implemented or aborted. Our challenge then, given the basic assumption that bilingualism in education is a plausible objective, is to understand how these programs can be improved and to convey this information to parents, teachers, and those in positions of responsibility in education. Now that we have clarified what we mean by "French language immersion programs" as "educational innovations", we now focus on the problem of defining implementation, adoption, outcome, and implementation process. In addition to disclosing the distinction between these four concepts, we will also clarify their relationship.

As pointed out previously, if boards are to achieve the intended outcomes of French language immersion programs, confusion regarding what is being attempted must be minimized. A high degree of clarity is required at the very outset as to what is being attempted. A noticeable feature of educational innovations is that they either fade away shortly after adoption or fall short of their intended objectives. This is at least partially attributable to a lack of clarity at the outset. To be successfully implemented in an educational setting, it is critically important that an educational innovation (such as a French language immersion program) be clearly defined and that the ongoing development and implementation of the innovation be a major concern of all those who are ("whether they know it or not") partners to the implementation process. What this means at the applied or classroom setting level--is that teachers be cognizant of what is being attempted and that they develop strategies to cope with problems of implementation. What this means external to the classroom is that those in positions of responsibility (i.e., principals and senior supervisory officers) also be concerned (highly motivated to play a leadership role) regarding implementation. It is of the utmost importance that people in positions of responsibility, in addition to being cognizant (in the sense of fully understanding) of what teachers are attempting to implement at the classroom level, actually undertake action strategies to facilitate teachers in their attempts to cope with problems of implementation. Where variance exists in these areas, one should not be too optimistic regarding implementation and corresponding achievement results among French language immersion students.

In the aftermath of recent attempts to implement educational innovations, a glimpse at the literature is revealing. The implementation of the critical aspects of curriculum are affected by not only what classroom teachers are willing to do and capable of doing vis-a-vis bringing about change but what those in positions of responsibility are (1) willing to do, (2) capable of doing, (3) actually do with respect to managing the change process. Our findings suggest that in general, persons in positions of responsibility are not enacting meaningful leadership roles in the implementation of French second language extended and immersion programs. By their own admission principals are only marginally involved in the ongoing development and implementation of immersion programs. During interviews, the majority of principals indicated that they played a supportive role rather than a leadership role with FSL extended and immersion teachers. Some principals described the situation in the following way:

> "I need training in purchasing materials and setting up curriculum"
>
> "I can't provide leadership to the immersion program. I don't even speak French"
>
> "It's important that an immersion principal can listen to and understand lessons being taught in French. I can't"
>
> "The French immersion program is pretty well left up to the classroom teacher. I steer clear of them"
>
> "I don't particularly care for immersion, but if it wasn't for the program this school would have closed"
>
> "My immersion teachers are competent and dedicated, the last thing they need is interference from this office"

> "This school has a definite philosophy of education. Our overall philosophy applies equally as well to immersion. The philosophy is more powerful than invididual teachers. As long as immersion teachers are teaching in French what their non-immersion colleagues are teaching in English - I'm happy".

The responses of principals seem to reinforce the belief that French language immersion programs are like sail boats without rudders. What can be speculated is that when the storm blows over, the boats will end up somewhere. Similarly, when forces unleash, French immersion programs get lobbed about. They end up somewhere in the seas of development and implementation. Specifically where--one is never too certain until the storm blows over.

It may be argued that French language immersion programs are complex programs to implement. The April 1981 edition of Education Manitoba carried an article entitled French Immersion which states that

> "The major goal of the immersion program are to provide an education whereby the child will possess all of the skills which he or she normally would have acquired in an English language school plus an in-depth knowledge of the French language and a greater appreciation of the francophone way of life".

The article also points out that

> "In a sense, immersion education is a distinctive and unique kine of educational experience: it resembles native French language schools and classes only to the degree that most of its educational experience is provided in French; it is similar to the English language schools in the sense that its clientele, linguistically speaking at least, is basically the same. Further, its curriculum, except for its unique French and English language arts courses, and possibly some minor content changes in social studies and music

> are the same as found in the English language schools; but they are, for the most part, at least at the beginning of the experience, in French rather than in English...immersions unique French and English language arts courses are different from those found in the native French language schools and classes. They must be, since the client group is not the same... the methodology used in immersion education, because of the nature of its program, is significantly different from that employed in other programs particularly at the elementary level".

To the investigators, this hardly appears like a ship without a rudder. The contrary is of course true. French language immersion programs require captains at the helm.

The heart of the implementation (pilotting) problem is being clear about the elements of the total program and the development of strategies for their attainment.

It is evident to the writers that one of the most neglected aspects of the programs we examined is in relation to a clear specification of (1) what is being attempted, and (2) desired student learning outcomes.

Once again, this need not cause alarm. Education has a long standing tradition of adopting educational innovations without giving adequate attention at the outset regarding (1) what precisely is being attempted, (b) specification of the factors which will likely serve to enhance and/or impede implementation, (c) strategies for coping with problems of implementation, and (d) the intended learning outcomes (both gains and losses) of students. The concepts which we find useful for understanding the relative statue of FSL extended and immersion programs are defined as follows:

Adoption is the decision to go ahead with the FSL extended or immersion program.

Implementation process includes procedural knowledge and action strategies for coping with problems of implementation.

Implementation is the form or actual use of the essential characteristics of FSL extended and immersion programs. Implementation is the FSL program in operation designed to achieve clearly defined sets of student learning outcomes.

Outcome refers to the intended student learning outcomes resulting from the implemented FSL extended or immersion program.

In general, it is important to be aware of these distinctions in order to understand what the implementation of FSL extended and immersion programs imply. It is not sufficient to merely state that an FSL extended or immersion program is being implemented or that the program is implemented.

In connection with the latter, the specific feature of the FSL extended or immersion program must be reported in terms of specific changes in (1) organization structure, (2) role/behaviour, (3) knowledge and understanding, (4) materials, and (5) value orientation.*

For instance, a critical examination of FSL core, extended and immersion programs would reveal (1) organizational differences between these programs, (2) differences in teaching approaches utilized in core, extended and immersion programs, (3) different beliefs underpinning the programs and their intended outcomes, (4) different materials utilized within the programs, and (5) variations in beliefs and commitment to the full range of FSL programs.

---

*These terms are clarified in considerable detail in Fullan (1977) and Burns, 1979. As a result, there is no need to elaborate their meaning here. Therefore, we proceed directly to their application.

Once again, when probing the implementation of FSL extended and immersion programs it is important to make a distinction between (1) the essential characteristics of FSL programs, and (2) the actual implementation of the essential characteristics. For instance, when implementing FSL extended or immersion programs, one must conceive the educational innovation in the context of changes associated with structure, teaching approaches, beliefs, materials and values. As one would expect, a lack of clear specification of what is being attempted (at the very outset of the adoption of an innovation) is a barrier to its potential implementation. Such clarity should be provided in the context of the aforementioned dimensions of programs. It is as Fullan (1978) states, an innovation is implemented to the extent that:

> "New structural or organizational features are put into practice, that the actual behavior of system members change, that system members know and understand the purposes, assumptions and behavioral methods of implementing what they are attempting, and that the system members value the innovation as desirable and worthwhile.

And

> "Implementation is the form of actual use of changes in structure, changes in role/ behavior, changes in knowledge and understanding, and changes in attitude and commit-

> ment to the innovation; implementation is the program in operation designed to achieve the intended outcomes of an innovation".

In keeping with the research objectives of this project, recommendations will be made for improving the implementation of FSL extended and immersion programs we studied. Some of the recommendations, as might be imagined will be in the context of important roles in the implementation of FSL core, extended and immersion programs. The reason for including core in the role clarity section of the report is because core and immersion programs do not only exist in contrast to each other; they also exist in contrast to core programs.

2.6 Implementation As Alterations of Existing Practice

In the discussion that follows we shall describe implementation of FSL extended and immersion programs as alterations from existing practices to sets of more desirable practices. This section is intentionally brief. Those seriously interested in improving the implementation of extended and immersion programs will find the Fullan and Park (1981) Curriculum Implementation Resource Booklet a refreshing approach.

What is important to highlight in this section of the report is that implementation does not appear to be in common use as a clearly understood concept by FSL extended and immersion teachers and principals. Our data suggests that it appears acceptable (at the present time) for implementation to mean just what individual teachers and principals choose it to mean. Our empirical work on curriculum implementation leads us to believe that a factor which may contribute considerably to this phenomenon is that educators have a tendency to view program implementation as a product rather than what implementation actually is; a process in interaction with products. The mere fact that a structure exists (for instance, early immersion organized in a dual-track school in which English is the language of the environment) for immersion education and that children (known as immersion children) interact with resources (known as immersion resources), does not in itself tell us anything about implementation. We take the approach that organization structure and resources (both human and material) are merely conditions for the implementation of FSL extended and immersion programs. They do not in themselves constitute an implemented program. Implementation does not begin to occur until teacher beliefs, teaching approaches and the affective orientation of teachers towards beliefs and teaching approaches are congruent with beliefs and teaching approaches underpinning a defensible FSL extended or immersion program. In this approach the object of change is not only school structure and materials but, teachers themselves. The latter can be more commonly referred to as the users of the FSL extended or immersion innovation.

What we are implying then, is that for implementation to occur (in the sense of implementing an FSL extended or immersion program) is that not only must changes occur in the conditions for change (structures and resources) but the users of the program (teachers) must undergo change

Figures C and D capture the essence of our intended meaning when we say (1) improving the implementation of FSL extended and immersion programs involves altering existing practices (potentially comprising structures, materials, beliefs and teaching approaches) to more desirable sets of practices (potentially involving structures, materials, beliefs, and teaching approaches) and (2) that not only must the conditions for change (structures and materials) be the object of modifications, but the users (in this instance, principals and teachers involved in extended and immersion programs) themselves must undergo change during the implementation process.

What is evident to us, is that the learning environments reflected in the modes of schooling illustrated in figure C are considerably different. As a result, one could reasonably expect differences to exist in the context of elements appearing in the figure. For instance, the French language arts program taught to francophones in a francophone school would be different from the French language arts taught to immersion students in a school housing French language immersion. As well, the teaching approaches utilized to teach French language arts to francophone students could be reasonably expected to be in variance with the teaching approaches utilized to teach French language arts to French language immersion students who are anglophones.

What is evident to us as well, is that the intended outcomes of the French second language programs illustrated

Figure C: Elements of Implementation: French Second Language Programs

Elements of Implementation	French Second Language Programs*		
	Core French	Extended French	French Language Immersion
Meta organization structure			
Materials			
Teaching Approaches			
Beliefs			
Commitment			

*The Ministry defines these programs (see Teaching and Learning French as a Second Language, 1977) as follows:

(1) Core Programs designate a basic pattern of instruction in French as a second language whereby pupils take a period of instruction in French each day, usually 20-40 minutes per day.

(2) Extended Programs are those which include a Core program in French as a second language as well as one or two other subjects in which French is the language of communication.

(3) Immersion Programs are those in which most of a pupil's instruction is given using French as the language of communication. Time allotments may vary; a frequent pattern is to expose pupils to heavy immersion in the first year or two of the program, then perhaps to reduce the immersion time in subsequent years.

Figure D: Elements of Implementation: Language Related Schooling

Elements of Implementation	Types of Schooling		
	Francophone Schooling	FSL Bilingual Schooling*	Anglophone Schooling
Meta Organization Structure			
Materials			
Teaching Approaches			
Beliefs			
Commitment			

*By FSL bilingual schooling, we mean French language immersion education for anglophones. The actual school may be a dual-track school in which English or French is the language of the environment, or it may be a French immersion centre--English being the language of the environment.

By francophone schooling, we mean education for francophones in schools in which French is the language of instruction and the environment.

By anglophone schooling, we mean education for anglophones in schools in which English is the language of instruction and the environment.

in figure D are considerably different. As a result, it is reasonable to expect between program differences in the key elements (meta structure, materials, teaching approaches, beliefs, and commitments) underpinning these different FSL programs.

As a further example, the English language arts program taught to non-immersion anglophones in an anglophone school setting or in the anglophone tracts of a dual-track FSL bilingual school setting is not likely to be the same as the English language arts program taught to French language immersion students housed in a bilingual school setting. This is a reasonable expectation. In the instance of early immersion, French is the language of instruction and communication from the very beginning of a child's school career. Most immersion programs now in operation adhere to a pattern of two or three years in which nearly 100% of the instructional time is given in French. If French is the medium in which early immersion pupils learn language arts, then it is evident that it is necessary to revise the language arts program normally taught to non-immersion anglophone pupils prior to its utilization in the immersion programs. The addage that an immersion program is simply an overlay of the total program normally taught to non-immersion anglophone students, but with components taught in French and others taught in English--needs to be challenged. As one immersion teacher put it, "an immersion program is much more than the sum of its parts". It is considerably more than a series of subjects--some taught in French, others taught in English.

The following are some of the more obvious between program differences. Firstly, organizationally, these programs deliver different rates (hours) of instruction in French. For instance, core French as noted on the figure C page is usually taught during a concentrated 20-40 minute period per day. The extended program in addition to the core time allotment for instruction in French may include the teaching of one or two actual subjects (for instance, geographie et science) in French. In an early immersion program, all subjects are taught in French until the introduction of English language arts (as a subject) perhaps as pointed out previously, in grade 2 or 3.

Secondly, the materials used in these three FSL programs can be expected to differ considerably. The previous paragraph implies this. Core French is of course taught as a course. French second language extended and immersion programs on the other hand are not courses. They are programs. Therefore, while the intended learning outcomes of the Core French program for students are in relation to a basic range of French language skills and basic levels of competency; and the extended program in relation to an intermediate range of French language skills and intermediate levels of competency as well as the acquisition of knowledge, affects and skills in relation to specific subject areas; the intended learning outcomes of immersion are in relation to a level of French language competency associated with bilingualism. As well, students pursuing immersion programs are expected to acquire all the knowledge, affects and skills that they would normally acquire if they were not pursuing immersion. It is evident that the nature and scope of materials underlying FSL core, extended and imersion programs will differ significantly.

Finally, teaching approaches and beliefs underpinning the successful implementation of these three approaches to French and education are presumably, program specific, and therefore, different. This is also true of course regarding French first language education. The teaching approaches and beliefs underpinning French first language education will differ significantly from those characterizing immersion (bilingual) education programs.

It is not our intent here to outline the specific differences in programmatic and behavioral regularities regarding FSL core, extended and immersion programs. Suffice it to point out that each approach to French and education is unique. As a result, each of the aforementioned elements is important to the implementation of defensible programs.

One of the points we have been emphasizing throughout this study is that French language immersion programs are educational innovations which after being adopted must be effectively implemented. Embedded in this way of thinking, and a consequence of it is an orientation, and even a preoccupation with, the essential characteristics of the different dimensions of French immersion programs.

Once an immersion program has been adopted, all kinds of things begin to happen and have to be done. Various kinds of materials have to be procured. Teachers have to be effectively trained in teaching approaches known to be effective in the achievement of the intended outcomes of immersion education.

In the final analysis, if insufficient attention is given to the structure, material, belief, and teaching approach dimensions of these programs, their intended outcomes for students will not be achieved in practice. It is thus that we talk about the implementation of FSL extended and immersion programs as a process of putting into practice (at the classroom level of the school setting) the essential characteristics of the innovation. When implementing a new FSL extended or immersion program, one is involved in altering structures, materials, beliefs and teaching approaches. Similarily, when undertaking to improve the implementation of an FSL extended or immersion program, implementation consists of alterations from existing practice to some new or revised practice (potentially involving structures, materials, beliefs, and teaching approaches) in order to achieve certain desired student learning outcomes. The logic of the process (adapted from Fullan and Park, 1981) is depicted in figure E.

Figure E The Logic of Improving the Implementation of an FSL Extended or Immersion Program

Goal	The Change	Implementation	Outcome
Desired Educational Goal(s)	The Extended or Immersion Curriculum	Altering Structures Altering Beliefs Altering Teaching Approaches Altering Materials	Improved Student Performance

Note: By curriculum we mean all subjects and all components of the program. For instance, in the case of early immersion, English language arts is part of the immersion curriculum.

2.7 The Need for a Coordinated Strategy and Ongoing Implementation: Principals and Teachers

Based on numerous studies, when implementing a complex educational innovation it is important to (1) establish a formal structure, (2) in which people within the setting and throughout the system, (3) work and deal with one another, (4) in a coordinated, and (5) cooperative manner, (6) for the purpose of developing, and (7) implementing the innovation. In this regard we asked teachers and principals several questions that have implications for the development and implementation of extended and immersion programs.

Seventy three percent of immersion teachers indicated French as their maternal tongue. This is in direct contrast to 19 percent of immersion principals listing French as their maternal tongue. While French immersion is a unique program and one which is challenging to implement, it is worth noting that 94 percent of the principals stated that they did not have any specialized training for being a principal in a school having a French immersion program. Similarly, 68 percent of immersion teachers indicated that they did not have any specialized training specifically designed for teaching French immersion. A full 75 percent of the latter group indicated that they had never been involved in any type of pre-service and 88 percent have not been involved in ongoing in-service. We of course know that specialized training and ongoing in-service linked to implementation problems are important. It is worth noting as well that

75% of principals stated they had not themselves been involved in either pre-service or in-service.

When asked about responsibility for determining what gets taught in French immersion, teachers and principals had different perceptions (see Table 2.1). For instance, while only 13 percent of principals believe teachers determine core, 31 percent of teachers view themselves as having this responsibility. Similarly, while 44 percent of principals are themselves determining core, only 31 percent of teachers view principals as having such responsibility. What is also interesting is that the majority of principals and teachers view teachers and principals assuming responsibility for core. It appears that the core curriculum is not planned at the systems' level.

This of course may have implications for the extent to which there is continuity from grade to grade on the core curriculum in French second language extended and immersion programs and whether leading concepts and lessons are integrated with one another across subject areas within different grade levels. It is worth noting that while 73 percent of the teachers and 88 percent of the principals indicate that continuity is plausible and a similar percentage of principals and teachers state that there is some integration or

that these characteristics are not likely to exist in the absence of a coordinated approach to curriculum development and in the absence of expertise.

Table 2.1 Percentage Frequency by French Immersion Teachers (N=48) and Principals (N=16) of Schools Housing Immersion to the Question:

Who is primarily responsible for determining what teachers will teach (core curriculum) at specific grade levels in French immersion programs?

	Principals %	Teachers %
Curriculum superintendent	13	21
School principal	44	31
Classroom teacher	13	31
Curriculum committees	13	4
Other	17	13
	100	100

Table 2.2 Percentage Frequency by French Immersion Teachers (N=48) and Principals (N=16) of Schools Housing Immersion to the Question:

Are you personally satisfied with the quality of the French immersion program in the following areas?

	Satisfied		Unsatisfied	
	Principal	Teacher	Principal	Teacher
Course content	76	82	24	18
Instructional materials	69	54	31	46
Teaching methods	87	81	13	19
Testing student performance	57	60	43	40
Units of studies	76	79	24	21

Table 2.3 Percentage responses of Immersion Teachers (N=51) to Specific Barriers

There are at times barriers to the implementation of new educational programs: Please comment on the extent to which each of the following is a barrier to developing French Immersion program.	Extremely important	Quite important	Important	Somewhat major	Not major
Lack of in-service training to teach French Immersion teachers how to develop their own instructional materials.	19	15	50	8	8
Lack of in-service training to teach French Immersion teachers how to effectively use instructional materials.	10	27	35	13	25
Availability of good instructional materials in French.	42	13	23	2	20
Lack of clarity of French Immersion goals.	15	19	27	6	33
Lack of clarity on the means to achieve goals.	10	17	27	15	36
Lack of psychological support from school administration.	19	19	19	8	35
Lack of psychological support from non-French immersion teachers.	15	21	10	19	35
Lack of administrative resource support (e.g., in-service programs)	19	29	21	17	14
Lack of regular meetings to assist teachers to cope with problems related to curriculum development.	38	15	17	6	25
French Immersion teacher turnover rate.	6	10	10	8	66
Lack of educational training related to curriculum development and implementation (e.g., no training at teachers college or faculties of education.	31	10	29	10	19
Lack of collaboration between boards (e.g., public and separate schools do not adequately cooperate).	25	25	15	17	29
Problems of adapting English language materials to French Immersion program needs.	33	19	8	13	27
The amount of time available for French instruction.	13	10	17	4	56
No evaluation tests to show if the program is working well or not.	23	33	25	6	12
Lack of support from the community at large.	13	10	19	6	44

Table 2.4 Percentage Responses of Immersion Principals (N=16) to Specific Barrier

There are at times barriers to the implementation of new educational programs: Please comment on the extent to which each of the following is a barrier to the development and implementation of French Immersion programs.	Extremely Important	Quite Important	Important	Somewhat major	Not major
Lack of in-service training to teach French Immersion teachers how to develop their own instructional materials.	13	31	44	-	10
Lack of in-service training to teach French Immersion teachers how to effectively use instructional materials.	13	6	31	13	31
Availability of good instructional materials in French	25	13	31	25	-
Lack of clarity of French Immersion goals.	13	25	13	25	19
Lack of clarity on the means to achieve goals.	13	19	38	6	13
Lack of psychological support from board administration.	6	6	31	6	44
Lack of psychological support from non-French Immersion teachers.	6	13	25	38	13
Lack of administrative resource support (e.g., in-service programs)	6	19	38	13	19
Lack of regular meetings to assist teachers to cope with problems related to curriculum development.	6	25	38	6	19
French Immersion teacher turnover rate.	6	25	13	6	44
Lack of educational training related to curriculum development and implementation (e.g., no training at teachers college or faculties of education).	13	25	13	44	-
Lack of collaboration between boards (e.g., public and separate schools do not adequately cooperate).	13	13	25	25	31
Problems of adapting English language materials to French Immersion program needs.	19	31	19	19	6
The amount of time available for French instruction.	6	19	13	25	31
No evaluation tests to show if the program is working or not.	19	31	19	19	6
Lack of support from the community at large.	6	19	13	38	19

Note: In some instances the question was not answered.

In fact table 2.2 suggests there is some dissatisfaction among immersion teachers regarding materials and testing student performance. When teachers were asked what could be done to improve immersion, numerous references were made to:

"lack of essential materials
"not having an overall program
"lack of standardization of curriculum
"lack of continuity
"lack of leadership
"need for a consultant to assist with the development of the program
"need for program evaluation
"lack of time for translating materials
"We're not given any help.

The teachers were also asked to comment on the extent to which certain factors are barriers to the development of French immersion programs. Table 2.3 shows their response. During the interviews respondents were asked to indicate important, quite important or extremely important only if the factor required attention. From the table, it can be seen that several factors need to be addressed. For instance, 57 percent say something has to be done about a lack of psychological support from the school administration. Sixty nine percent see in-service as being problematic. Seventy percent suggest that there is a need to do something about regular meetings to assist teachers to cope with problems related to curriculum development.

Table 2.4 shows the responses of principals to this question. The responses of principals are indeed similar to teachers. The data should prove useful in decision making for improving program development and implementation.

Table 2.5 Percentage Responses of Principals and Teachers to the question:

Does your school have a library/ resource centre with materials in French for French Immersion students?

	Principals	Teachers
Yes	75	63
No	25	37

If Yes, how do you find these materials?

	Principals	Teachers
Very Adequate	19	13
More than Adequate	13	4
Adequate	13	15
Somewhat Inadequate	19	17
Not Adequate	19	23

Missing data were non-applicable responses.

Table 2.6 Teacher and Principal Response to the question:

Does your school have the services of
a French Remedial Teacher available
to you?

	Principal	Teacher
Yes	44	54
No	56	46

Table 2.7 Teacher and Principal Clarification (percentage response) Regarding how Improvements are Brought About in Curriculum

How influential are the following knowledge resources from outside the school on French Immersion in terms of bringing about improvement?	Extremely Influential	Quite Influential	Influential	Somewhat Influential	Not Influential
TEACHERS					
New ideas from research/literature	8	15	35	17	15
New programs	17	29	27	6	16
New products	8	23	31	10	17
New materials	13	31	27	8	10
Resource personnel from other boards	15	15	17	15	29
Resource personnel from the university community	8	6	17	13	44
Canadian Association of Immersion Teachers	4	10	8	27	40
Association of Canadian Parents for French	3	8	4	15	58
PRINCIPALS					
New ideas from research/literature	13	19	38	25	5
New programs	13	38	38	6	5
New products	19	19	38	13	12
New materials	18	38	38	6	-
Resource personnel from other boards	13	31	38	13	5
Resource personnel from the university community	6	6	6	50	37
Canadian Association of Immersion Teachers	6	25	19	13	37
Association of Canadian Parents for French	-	-	6	25	69

Table 2.8 Teacher Satisfaction Regarding Different Aspects of the Immersion Program (percentage responses).

Generally, how satisfied/dissatisfied are you with the following aspects of the French Immersion program?	Extremely Satisfied	Satisfied	No Particular Issue	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Quite Dissatisfied
Development of English competence	25	42	21	6	0
Development of competence in French	23	65	2	4	2
Development in subject areas other then language (Note any particular subject)	23	48	4	2	2
______________________					
Aids in social relations between groups (e.g., understanding French culture and people)	15	50	25	4	6
Opportunities for individual attention, instruction related to child's needs or interests	10	52	8	19	4
Attitude of child (children) to program and school	31	48	13	6	2
Adequacy of facilities - e.g., library, resources, gym	13	29	8	31	15
Communications with home	17	58	13	10	-
Reporting of student progress/achievement	21	67	-	4	4
Quality, frequency of co-curricular and extra-curricular activities	17	33	19	15	8
Program balance (English and French)	17	46	4	23	2
Opportunities for encouragement of extension of use of French beyond the school	2	25	12	40	17
Quality of texts and resources for program given in French	6	44	2	33	15
Continuity of curriculum	6	42	8	17	13

*Less than 100% are instances of missing data.

Table 2.9 Principal Satisfaction Regarding Different Aspects of the Immersion Program (percentage responses)

Generally, how satisfied/dissatisfied are you with the following aspects of the French Immersion program?	Extremely Satisfied	Satisfied	No Particular Issue	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Quite Unsatisfied
Development of English competence	50	31	19	4	-
Development of competence in French	44	44	-	13	-
Development in subject areas other than language (Note any particular subject) ____________________	19	44	25	13	-
Aids in social relations between groups (e.g., understanding French culture and people)	6	56	31	6	-
Opportunities for individual attention, instruction related to child's needs or interests	31	38	19	6	6
Attitude of child (children) to program and school	31	35	19	13	-
Adequacy of facilities - e.g., library, resources, gym	38	25	13	25	-
Communications with home	6	75	13	6	-
Reporting of student progress/achievement	13	75	13	-	-
Quality, frequency of co-curricular and extra-curricular activities	31	31	25	13	-
Program balance (English and French)	25	63	6	6	-
Opportunities for encouragement of extension of use of French beyond the school	6	31	13	50	-
Quality of texts and resources for program given in French	6	38	50	6	6
Continuity of curriculum	13	56	6	25	-

Table 2.10 The Percentage Response of Teachers Regarding French Immersion Beliefs

Statement	Response
French Immersion programs are not a good idea because they make children in them different from their friends	100 percent of principals and 96 percent of teachers disagree.
French Immersion programs are not a good idea because they create an elite group.	81 percent of principals and 83 percent of teachers disagree.
The money spent on French Immersion would be better spent on improving instruction in French available to students in all English schools.	82 percent of principals and 88 percent of teachers disagree.
The money spent on French Immersion would be better spent on improving instruction in French available to students in French language schools.	94 percent of principals and 85 percent of teachers disagree.
The money spent on French immersion would be better spent on improving instruction in all subjects throughout the school system.	95 percent of principals and 88 percent of teachers disagree.
Many children come out of French Immersion programs deficient in English language skills.	88 percent of principals and percent teachers disagree.
French immersion is the best way for English speaking children to become truly bilingual.	88 percent of principals and 85 percent of teachers agree.
French immersion makes school more interesting for children.	69 percent of principals and 63 percent of teachers agree.
The presence of French Immersion in Ontario schools shows Quebec that we are concerned about Canadian unity.	68 percent of principals were neutral or disagreed and 46 percent of teachers agreed.
A bilingual person is a better educated person.	63 percent of principals and 58 percent of teachers agree.

Table 2.11 The Percentage Responses of Principals and Teachers Regarding Controversial Issues

There is some controversy among educators about how much French is enough. Could you aid us in this discussion by giving your views on the following:	YES		NO	
	Principals	Teachers	Principals	Teachers
French Immersion students should be required to use their French in all extra curricular activities where dual language opportunities are available in the community (e.g., join a French verse English hockey league)	26	56	56	29
Do you feel a student should spend as much time doing French homework as he/she does for any other subject	88	91	12	6
Do you feel children have adequate opportunities to practise their French speaking skills in class	81	75	19	22
Do you feel school should provide children with more opportunities to travel to locations in Quebec where the majority of the people speak French	64	68	19	20
Do you feel that because some children in French Immersion are more fluent in French (because of their backgrounds) that they have an unfair advantage in entering French Immersion programs	25	27	68	67
Do you feel the French Immersion program in your area should put more emphasis on grammar and reading skills	6	34	69	52
Do you feel the French Immersion program in your area should put more emphasis on speaking and listening skills	63	80	25	14
Do you feel the teachers in your French Immersion program are capable in French	100	81	0	6
Do you feel that teachers in your French Immersion program are academically well qualified	94	83	6	12

Note: Missing responses took a neutral position.

Table 2.12 The Percentage Response of Principals and Teachers to:

How important do you think the French language radio and television is in aiding your French Immersion students master French.	Teachers	Principals
1. Very important	21	19
2. Quite important	21	13
3. Important	23	25
4. Little importance	28	38
5. Not important	8	6
How supportive would you say non-immersion teachers are of immersion programs.		
1. Extremely supportive	0	0
2. Very supportive	4	6
3. Supportive	52	31
4. Indifferent	25	31
5. Unsupportive	13	31
Do you think Canada is capable of achieving the goal of bringing the two language groups together through French Immersion programs?		
1. Can be very instrumental in achieving these goals	31	25
2. Can probably effect these goals	25	38
3. Only minor effect on the achievement of these goals	27	25
4. Not able to achieve these goals	4	13
In your opinion are French Immersion parents as a group satisfied or dissatisfied with their children's academic progress?		
1. Unsatisfied	0	0
2. Somewhat unsatisfied	0	6
3. Satisfied	33	38
4. Very satisfied	44	50
5. Extremely satisfied	21	6
Has your attitude towards French Immersion changed for the better or worse in any way over the last few years?		
1. Much better	25	6
2. Better	27	19
3. Same	42	75
4. Somewhat worse	4	0
5. Much worse	2	0

Table 2.13 The Percentage Response of Principals and Teachers to:

	Principal	Teacher
Is your Board planning to extend opportunities for learning French into the secondary school level (beyond the regular French courses available in the English language schools) for students presently in the French Immersion program?		
Yes	56	50
No	25	17
Other	9	23
Do you think parents of students presently in the French Immersion program want additional opportunities for learning French extended to the secondary school level?		
Yes	81	77
No	13	4
Other	6	19

Table 2.5 suggests as well that library resources may be in need of attention.

Teachers and principals were also asked if their school had the services of a French remedial teacher available to them. Table 2.6 shows that for numerous pupils, such a teacher is not available.

We also wondered how improvements were brought about in the curriculum of French immersion programs. Table 2.7 shows the responses of teachers and the responses of principals.

Table 2.8 and 2.9 deals with the teacher and principal satisfaction regarding different aspects of the French immersion program. It is evident from the data presented that teachers and principals, and teachers alike are somewhat unsatisfied with opportunities to encourage the use of French beyond school, and with adequacy of facilities (e.g., library, resources, etc.) These factors should be taken into consideration in the context of improvement initiatives. The general view cf these two tables is that teachers and principals appear to be a rather satisfied lot regarding the issues probed.

Table 2.10 shows a high degree of congruency between the perception of principals and teachers regarding issues; not quite as controversial as those reported on in table 2.11 The issues of increased emphasis on grammar and reading skills warrants close examination as does the issue of speaking and listening skills. These areas have implications

Table 2.14 The Percentage Response of Principals and Teachers to:

Do you think there will be problems in extending French Immersion into high schools?	Principals	Teachers
1. No problems	19	6
2. Minimal problems	38	19
3. Normal transition	0	6
4. Some problems	38	44
5. Severe problems	6	19
Would there be problems to re-integrating French Immersion students into unilingual Anglophone elementary school?		
1. No problems	50	40
2. Minimal problems	38	27
3. Normal transition	6	6
4. Some problems	6	23
5. Severe problems	0	2
How about problems of integration in a unilingual French language high school?		
1. No problems	19	21
2. Minimal problems	13	23
3. Normal transition	13	13
4. Some problems	56	31
5. Severe problems	0	2
Do you think the subject material given to French Immersion students is different in content from other programs?		
1. Very different	0	4
2. Somewhat different	50	19
3. Same	50	67

Note: Instance of no answer.

TABLE 2.14 - continued

Should French Immersion courses be different in content from regular courses?	Principals	Teachers
1. Should be different	12	19
2. Should be somewhat the same	38	31
3. Should be the same	50	42
4. It makes no difference	0	4

Do you think the cost of expanding French Immersion to the secondary level is justified compared to other program needs?	Principals	Teachers
1. No justification	0	4
2. Minor justification, but not worth it	13	6
3. Justifiable	69	40
4. Should be a priority	6	29
5. Should be the highest priority	12	10

What is the ideal grade to introduce children to French Immersion?

Grade:	Kindergarten	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Principal		38	38	6	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0
Teacher		67	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Do you feel French should be optional or compulsory for Anglophone students not in French Immersion programs (circle one in each row)

	Optional		Undecided		Compulsory	
	Prin.	Tchrs.	Prin.	Tchrs.	Prin.	Tchrs.
In grades 1-3:	25	19	0	4	75	73
In grades 4-6:	25	19	6	2	69	73
In grades 7-9:	63	29	0	6	38	58
In grades 10-12.	75	48	13	13	13	33

Note: Instances of no answer.

for programmatic and behavioral regularities. The data should be examined closely. Table 2.13 provides insight into planning at the system level. It appears from the data that parents of students presently in immersion want additional opportunities extended to the secondary school level. Table 2.14 suggests that there may in fact be problems of fulfilling parental expectations. Both principals and teachers have indicated by their answers that they do indeed expect some problems. It is worth noting as well that principals and teachers are less skeptical of immersion graduates' potential in unilingual French language settings at the high school level than would normally be expected given that parents appear to be not quite as optimistic.

While the foregoing data are only tentative, they do provide insight into the internal functionings of immersion programs. Suffice it to point out here, that immersion programs are encountering some problems of implementation. For implementation to be improved it will be necessary to coordinate the ongoing development and implementation of these programs. This is particularly important in view of the fact that immersion is a growing phenomenon and will continue to work its way to the secondary level. Particularly noteworthy is the issue of materials, remedial resources, and the need to plan the use of in-service to address implementation plans. These, of course, will be addressed more directly in the section on policy recommendations.

2.8 Student Responses

Immersion students are themselves a valuable source of information. We asked students (see student questionnaire in appendix, a variety of questions. Table 2.15 provides data on affective considerations regarding immersion. The table shows that 97 of the respondents agree/strongly agree that they are in immersion because it will give them better access to jobs.

This has several implications. In the first instance, immersion parents and immersion students view immersion as providing ready access to occupational opportunity structure. This raises the question, as mentioned previously, of whether or not immersion graduates will be sufficiently skilled to compete successfully with bilingual francophone job applicants. We realize that this question may appear somewhat premature and perhaps presumptuous. On the other hand, our data are clear. Immersion in the minds of numerous people will lead to better jobs. The question of the nature, scope and intensity of bilingualism that immersion education can be reasonably expected to produce in students needs to be canvassed. As well, once the intended learning outcomes of immersion education have been clarified and agreed upon, it becomes critically important to alter existing practices to sets of more appropriate practices (potentially involving teaching beliefs, teaching approaches, and materials) towards those which will achieve immersion intended outcomes.

Table 2.15 The Percentage Response of FSL Extended and Immersion Students (Grades 6,7, & 8) to Motivational Factors

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Dis-agree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
I am in a French Immersion program because it will give me better access to jobs some day.	75	22	1	1	1
French Immersion classes are very important and valuable to me.	49	40	6	1	4
I look forward to French Immersion classes.	29	54	5	3	9
Most of the French Immersion classes are boring.	8	10	35	36	11
Most of my friends are in French Immersion.	36	35	16	9	4
I like people to know that I am a French Immersion student.	26	42	12	4	16
French Immersion makes school more interesting for students.	37	37	12	6	8
I often wonder why I am in a French Immersion program.	10	15	31	37	7
I enjoy speaking French.	54	35	4	2	5

N = 233

Table 2.16 The Percentage Response of FSL Extended and Immersion Students (Grades 6,7, & 8) to Program Related Considerations

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Dis-Agree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
If I was not in a French Immersion program my parents would be able to help me more with my homework.	23	20	33	21	3
Homework is easier for students who are not in a French Immersion program.	17	20	31	23	9
If I were not in a French Immersion program my marks would be higher.	10	20	29	25	16
I find homework a frustrating experience because I have inadequate ability in French to do homework assignments.	9	17	36	29	9
Students who are in the French Immersion program have to work harder than students who are not in French Immersion.	37	22	22	13	6
If I were not in French Immersion I would contribute more ideas and opinions to topics under discussion in the class.	9	24	29	21	17
If I have difficulty expressing myself in French, my teacher would encourage me to express myself in English.	7	24	26	34	9
In our French Immersion classes students participate (asking questions, joining in discussions, etc.) more than in other classes.	15	32	27	9	17
In French Immersion classes students really help each other.	22	49	14	5	10

N = 233

Table 2.17 The Percentage Response of FSL Extended and Immersion Students (Grades 6, 7, & 8) Regarding Secondary School Language Related Considerations

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Dis-Agree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
When I am in high school I would like to take several courses in the French language each year.	23	44	15	6	12
After grade eight, I would like to proceed to a bilingual secondary school where all subjects are available in English and French and I can elect to pursue any or all courses in the language of my choice.	44	29	10	5	12
After grade eight, I would like to proceed to an English language secondary school where several subjects (at each grade level) will be available in French.	35	36	12	6	11
After grade eight, I would like to proceed to a French language secondary school.	9	11	39	29	12
If I had to attend a French language secondary school, I could be successful.	14	48	14	11	13
I often wonder if I should bother keeping up my studies in French.	8	18	26	36	12

N = 233

Table 2.18 The Percentage Response of FSL Extended and Immersion Students (Grades 6, 7, & 8) Regarding Their French Language Subject Plans

After grade eight I plan to take the following number of subjects (each year) in French in secondary school.

Number subjects in the French language	%
1 subject in French	16
2 subjects in French	16
3 subjects in French	26
4 subjects in French	16
5 subjects in French	6
6 subjects in French	1
7 subjects in French	1
All subjects in French	6
No response	8
	100%

N = 233

Table 2.19 The Percentage Response of FSL Extended and Immersion Students Regarding Social Considerations

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Dis-Agree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
Outside the classroom I spend a lot of time playing with friends who are not in Immersion.	20	26	29	17	8
A lot of my friends are Francophones.	13	23	29	29	6
I think it is important that Quebec remain a part of Canada	62	25	2	5	6
I enjoy French language radio.	7	25	27	25	16
I enjoy French language television.	17	40	20	17	6
Most of my close friends speak French.	29	25	21	19	6
If something was bothering me about being in French Immersion I would feel comfortable in talking to my parents about it.	39	38	8	9	6

N = 233

Table 2.15 also shows that students have a positive attitude towards immersion and their classes. Eighty three percent state they look forward to immersion classes. Table 2.16 provide insight into some behavioral regularities within the program. For instance, 71 percent say that in immersion classes, students really help each other and that students in immersion tend to participate more in discussions than other classes. The program as well appears to promote the work ethic. They (59%) believe they have to work harder.

Table 2.17 shows that the majority of immersion students (67%) plan to take several courses in the French language each year when in high school. Their first choice of school appears to be a bilingual high school or an English language secondary school where several subjects (at each grade level) will be available in French. On the other hand, if they had to attend a French language secondary school a large percentage (62%) indicate they could be successful. Finally, 56 percent state that they plan to take 3 or more subjects in French each year. These data should be examined closely. They have implications for the long range planning of immersion programs along the primary/junior, intermediate, and senior division continuums. The last table in this section (2.19) provides an overview of some social implications of immersion. The fact that 87 percent of immersion agree/ strongly agree that it is important that Quebec remain a part of Canada and the fact that 89 percent (see table 2.15) enjoy speaking French, speaks well of immersion and the future of Canada. The federal government may indeed achieve some of its national goals through fostering bilingualism in education.

2.9 French Immersion Parents

The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of data gleaned from the parent questionnaire. All families (N=818) of the total immersion population within the participating boards were surveyed. The percent returned (completed) questionnaires is notably high at 80 percent. We observed a high degree of interest in this study by principals, teachers, pupils and parents alike. Our finding while not generalizable beyond the population surveyed, is representative. As a result, our data should accurately reflect attitudes, opinions and experiences of parents within the school setting communities included in our survey.

Table 2.20 deals with reasons that influenced parental decision to enter their children in immersion. The first four statements shows the factors at work. Eighty eight percent of parents believe that immersion education will give their children a better access to jobs. Eighty eight percent also indicated that it is important to learn another language. 82 percent believe that mastery of a second language is an important part of education and 74 percent view immersion as a form of enrichment. It is particularly noteworthy that educationally based personnel were not a factor in the majority of cases. Eighty eight percent

Table 2.20 Percentage Distribution of Immersion Family's Beliefs Regarding Factors Affecting the Decision to Enrol Child in Immersion

How important would you estimate that each of the following was in your decision to enrol your child in French Immersion?	Very Important Consideration	Important Consideration	Minor Consideration	No Influence
It would give my child a better access to jobs.	58	30	9	3
It is important to learn another language.	52	36	10	2
My belief that mastery of second language is an important part of education.	42	35	11	7
Immersion is a form of enrichment.	34	40	17	9
French Immersion helps children to regain Francophone identity.	10	15	22	53
Canada's future depends upon bilingual citizens.	17	21	27	35
Children's friends were in the program.	3	3	11	83
My friends had enroled their child in the Immersion program.	1	2	11	86
Teacher, principal, superintendent, trustee or consultant convinced me of the programs merit.	4	8	13	75
Recommendation of a relative in another community who was involved with Immersion program.	1	2	5	92

N = 233

indicated that teacher, principal, superintendent, trustee or consultant were not a factor. This raises the question of the information network regarding immersion. The writers have become cognizant during the course of this study that while immersion education is a growing phenomenon, numerous ratepayers are not meaningfully aware of its existence. This, of course, has implications for accessibility. Immersion education may therefore, not exist, as a potential opportunity structure for achieving bilingualism. It is critically important that school based personnel develop mechanisms to ensure public awareness of French second language extended immersion education.

Table 2.21 provides an overview of some general beliefs or opinions regarding immersion. It is evident from the data that immersion parents have high positive beliefs. For instance, 89 percent believe immersion is the best way for their immersion children to become truly bilingual. Almost half believe that immersion makes school more interesting while more than half believe a bilingual person is a better educated person. The data also show that immersion parents are very supportive of costs associated with immersion education. It is of particular interest that the second section of Table 2.21 shows that immersion parents have some reservations regarding components of the existing immersion program. For example, 32 percent of parents agree or strongly agree that the local program should put more emphasis on grammar and reading skills. As well, a full 47 percent agree/

Table 2.21 Percentage Distribution of General Personal Beliefs of Immersion Parents Regarding Immersion

Personal Beliefs Regarding French Immersion	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
French Immersion is the best way for English-speaking children to become truly bilingual.	61	28	7	2	2
French Immersion makes school more interesting for children.	14	35	36	12	3
A bilingual person is a better educated person.	27	25	16	18	14
Cost of expanding French Immersion to the secondary level is well justified compared to other program needs.	26	34	24	10	6
French Immersion programs are not a good idea because they make children in them different from their friends.	1	1	6	30	62
French Immersion programs are not a good idea because they create an elite group.	1	2	6	32	59
The money spent on French Immersion would be better spent on improving instruction in French available to students in all English schools.	3	6	17	40	34
The money spent on French Immersion would be better spent on improving instruction in French available to students in French language schools.	1	2	11	38	48
The money spent on French Immersion would be better spent on improving instruction in all subjects throughout the school system.	5	4	17	42	32
Many children come out of French Immersion programs deficient in English language skills.	5	10	21	35	29

Table 2.21 con't.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
French Immersion courses should be different in content from regular courses.	2	7	14	51	26
French language radio and television is very important in aiding French Immersion students master French.	14	43	27	0	16
My attitude towards French Immersion has changed for the better over the last few years.	17	37	31	11	4
French Immersion aids in bringing the French and the English together.	14	43	25	12	6
There will be problems extending French Immersion to the high school.	12	38	23	21	6
In general, the French community supports immersion.	7	40	34	12	7
Non-immersion teachers worry that Immersion programs limit their funds and may cost their jobs.	16	27	35	14	8
In general, the English community supports Immersion.	7	47	27	14	5
Schools should provide immersion children with opportunities to travel to locations in Quebec where the majority of the people speak French.	14	34	26	17	9
Children in French Immersion who are more fluent in French (because of their backgrounds) than others, have an unfair advantage in entering French Immersion programs.	7	18	20	43	12
The French Immersion program in our area should put more emphasis on grammar and reading skills.	9	23	43	19	6
The French Immersion program in our area should put more emphasis on speaking and listening skills.	12	35	34	14	5
The teachers in our French Immersion program are capable in French.	36	52	11	1	0
Teachers in our French Immersion program are academically well qualified.	30	48	18	3	1
French Immersion should be extended to the secondary level.	35	35	17	7	6
The cost of expanding French Immersion to the secondary level is justified compared to other program needs.	21	34	28	9	8

strongly agree that the immersion program should put more emphasis on speaking and listening skills. Significant percentages of respondents are neutral on relation to these issues. What is particularly noteworthy is that few parents disagree/strongly disagree on these curriculum related issues. This does not surprise the authors. Earlier data suggested that there may be problems of curriculum development and curriculum application in immersion programs. This can be partially attributed to several factors. First, immersion teachers and principals tend not to receive specialized training. Secondly, they are not covertly involved in in-service linked to implementation problems. Thirdly, the principals of immersion programs, given that they tend to be unilingual are unlikely to be capable of providing leadership regarding the French language arts component of immersion program--including individual subjects and themes taught in French. Fourthly, according to qualitative data given us during the study, it would appear that in general, immersion and extended program teachers are pretty well left on their own regarding curricula. We suspect (see section of report on altering practices) that major improvements are required in certain components of extended and immersion programs. What is perhaps most striking about parental response regarding the curriculum is that they seen to want more (core and structure) grammar and yet also want process improved, (more emphasis on speaking and listening). For the latter to occur changes are likely required in elements of programs related to materials, beliefs and teaching approaches. The latter two are particularly important. They imply that teachers as users of innovations must themselves become the object of change.

Tables 2.22 and 2.23 reflect further quantitative data from parents. The latter table (2.23) shows that parents have reservations regarding French immersion centres. Yet this is becoming an increasingly popular mode of school organization for housing French language immersion programs. Table 2.23 shows that eight percent of respondents (French immersion parents) say that immersion programs should be housed in a separate building with a separate principal. More immersion parents (16 percent) according to the same table state that immersion programs should exist in a francophone school with a francophone principal. Sixty five percent of the respondents (see talbe 2.23) selected the dual-track mode of school organization as being the preferred type of setting. Table 2.22 provides even richer data on this question--the question of preferred type of school organization (dual-track versus French immersion centre). The table also provides information regarding preferred language of the school environment. In connection with the latter, the dual-track school may potentially have English or French as the language of the environment. On the immersion centre or dual-track school issue the table shows that 17 percent of parents disagree/strongly disagree that immersion should be housed in dual-track schools where

Table 2.22 Percentage Immersion Parent Response Regarding:

Experiences, Preferences and Perceptions as a result of having a child(ren) in a French Immersion Program	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Children who enter into French Immersion programs have sufficient knowledge of French to handle homework in the early grades (e.g., the first three years).	11	39	22	18	10
I believe it is easier for French Immersion students to do homework if their parents are fluent in French.	35	45	6	11	3
Homework becomes more difficult for French Immersion students whose parents are not fluent in French as the student progresses (by grade) in the program.	23	36	20	16	5
I had considerable involvement with other parents with children in French Immersion prior to enrolling my child in Immersion.	2	11	8	52	27
The subject material given to French Immersion students is different in content from other programs.	2	12	44	36	6
Subjects such as history/geography (social studies) are given different emphasis or different content when taught in a French Immersion program.	2	12	47	31	8
I find it difficult to assist my immersion child with homework because I have inadequate ability in French.	16	33	11	28	12
Non-Immersion parents of Anglophone students are positive towards the French Immersion program.	5	22	46	21	6
Francophones within the community are supportive of French Immersion programs.	7	43	38	10	2
Parents of students presently in the French Immersion program want additional opportunities for learning French extended to the secondary school level.	25	39	24	9	3

Table 2.22 con't.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Our Board of Education is planning to extend opportunities for learning French into the secondary level (courses beyond the regular French courses available in English language secondary schools) for students presently in the French Immersion program.	15	37	39	6	3
After grade eight, I would like my immersion child to proceed to an English language secondary school where several subjects (at each grade level) will be available in the French language.	30	33	17	11	6
After grade eight, I would like my immersion child to proceed to a French language secondary school where only English as a subject is taught in English.	3	4	19	36	38
After grade eight, I would like my immersion child to proceed to a bilingual secondary school where all subjects are available in English and French and where he/she can elect to pursue any or all courses in the language of his/her choice.	42	30	16	8	4
I suspect that there will not be any problems in extending additional opportunities for learning French to French Immersion students at the secondary school level.	6	34	28	23	9
When my immersion child moves on to the secondary school level I would like him/her to have whatever opportunities are required to increase his/her French language fluency.	36	49	10	4	1
French Immersion programs are becoming increasingly popular among ratepayers.	13	39	34	10	4
Implementing the French Immersion program has progressed smoothly in our community.	10	54	16	15	5
The French Immersion program is fulfilling the educational expectations that I have for my child.	25	53	14	7	1
I often doubt the merits of keeping my child in the French Immersion program.	4	14	11	42	29
I find it easy to discuss my immersion child's progress with school personnel.	24	57	10	7	2

Table 2.23 Percentage Immersion Parent Response Regarding How Much Contact French Immersion and Non-Immersion Students Should Have in School Settings

	%
Have a French Immersion program with a separate principal in a separate building from other programs.	8
Have a French Immersion program in a separate part of an Anglophone (English speaking) school as a separate program with a common principal.	30
Have a French Immersion program in a Francophone school with a Francophone principal.	16
Have a French Immersion program which is run such that French Immersion is taken as a class part of the day and Immersion children take other classes with non-immersion students the rest of the day but all under the same principal.	35
Other	11
	100

N = 592

immersion and non-immersion anglophone students are housed in the same building. Thirty one percent of parents are undivided on this issue and 52 percent prefer this form of school organization.

Fewer parents prefer to have French as the language of the environment in dual-track schools than English as the language of the environment. However, a significant percentage (31 percent) agree/strongly agree that it is better to have French immersion programs in dual-track schools in which immersion and Francophone students are housed in the same building. These findings that few parents (only 26 percent) disagree/strongly disagree that this is better, may be surprising to some people. More boards operating schools in which French is the language of the environment may want to give serious consideration to the merits of operating such schools (dual-track schools) in which French is the language of the environment. Logic would have it that a school in which French is the language of the environment is an ideal type environment for learning French during the course of one's school career. In cultural terms alone, such school environments more closely reflect francophone culture. As well, the opportunity structures for learning and practicing French would be more natural. In human terms such an environment provides greatly increased opportunities for hearing, speaking, reading and writing French.

Attempting to offer immersion in small anglophone dual-track school settings may be problematic. That is, the immersion program may erode the nature and scope of opportunity structures (because of competing for resources both human and material) normally available to non-immersion anglophone students or insufficient resources may exist to mount an appropriate program. Immersion in a dual-track school in which French is the language of the environment (even if the school is small) may prove less problematic. Particularly, if as we observed during the course of this study, that immersion children are totally integrated with francophone students by grade four, five or six. We believe that immersion education in francophone settings provides exciting possibilities for achieving bilingualism in education.

On the other hand, we recognize the consternation that the presence of anglophones in francophone schools and in francophone classroom settings creates among francophone parents and francophone teachers. One concerned parent expressed his concern in the following way in a letter forwarded to a school principal when faced with the possibility of anglophones being integrated in francophone classroom settings:

> "Chère Présidente,
>
> C'est avec consternation que ma femme et moi avons étudié la repartition des élèves qui se présenteront a la prématernelle de l'école St-   de...ce septembre prochain. Nous remarquons la présence d'anglophones qui se fera sentir dans la classe de notre enfant... et qui selon nous, ne fera qu'accélérer le processus

> d'anglicisation, processus qui assimile déjà nos enfants hors du milieu scolaire français. Nous croyons sincèrement que ces petits anglais, bien que voulant apprendre la langue français, le feront au détriment du développement de nos enfants français qui sont integrés avec ces anglais. C'est une situation absolument inacceptable car nous voulons donner a nos enfants la meilleure éducation francophone dans une classe dépourvue de gens qui ne peuvent pas converser en français dés le debut de l'annee scolaire. Nous espérons que le conseil pourra remédier cette situation car nous, parents francophones, croyons que nous méritons d'offrir a nos enfants tous les advantages d'une éducation française avec des groupes homogénes de francophones."

This of course raises the question of immersion for whom and at what expense. We pointed out previously (see Burns and Olson, 1981) that immersion may frequently have unintended consequences. While immersion education may be a net gain to a particular set of students, programs may have unintended consequences for non-immersion students. What is vitally important is that the adoption, development and implementation of opportunities for achieving bilingualism in education ought to be the result of sound planning. The total curriculum must be based on sound principals of curriculum organization in the context of the total curriculum of the school setting.

Finally, the data in table 2.22 show that while dual-track schools in which English or French are the languages of the environment are preferred over French immersion centres (62 percent disagree/strongly disagree regarding the latter), parents tend not to favour the idea of their children attending francophone schools and the type of integration alluded to in the aforementioned letter. Only

18 percent agree/strongly agree that those who wish to learn French should attend a French language school.

Research on (1) French immersion centres, (2) dual-track immersion schools in which French is the language of the environment, and (3) unilingual French schools which totally integrate anglophone children in francophone classes is needed. It is worth pointing out that while the question of whether immersion children should attend dual-track schools or French immersion centres continues to be the subject of considerable interest among parents and debate among educators--preliminary data (see Lapkin et al, 1979) suggest that the immersion setting may foster enhanced achievement in some aspects of French and English language skills relative to dual-track schools. The authors are not in the least surprised by these tentative findings. It has been evident throughout our study that there may be several possible reasons for enhanced achievement in the immersion centre schools. In addition to those mentioned in the Lapkin, Andrew, Harley, Swain, and Kamin study we believe the following situations are more likely to exist in immersion centres:

(1) principals are bilingual;

(2) principals provide leadership with respect to the coordination of activities for achieving bilingual education curriculum goals of the school;

(3) more resources are available for subjects taught in French;

(4) staff (those teaching subjects in French and those teaching in English) develop a sense of collective consciousness and are mutually supportive in relation to working together to achieve immersion goals;

(5) greater potential for developing the curriculum or the basis of sound curriculum organization;

(6) long range planning;

(7) closer monitoring of the bilingual education budget;

(8) coordinated in-service to improve immersion.

By comparison, our empirical findings (based on interview data gleaned from immersion teachers and principals of schools housing immersion) suggest the following is more likely to be the case with respect to dual-track schools in which English is the language of the environment:

(1) principals are not bilingual;

(2) principals are unlikely to provide leadership with respect to the coordination of activities for achieving bilingual education curriculum goals of the school;

(3) few resources are available for subjects taught in French;

(4) staff (those teaching subjects or components of the program in French and those teaching subjects or components of the program in English) do not develop a sense of collective consciousness and are not mutually supportive in relation to working together to achieve immersion goals;

(5) teachers teaching subjects or components of the immersion program in English do not adapt materials, teaching approaches and beliefs to bilingual education requirements;

(6) programs are not evaluated;

(7) the curriculum along the school continuum (say JK to grade 8) is not developed on the basis of sound curriculum organization and within accordance to the principles of continuity, integration and growth;

(8) lack of long range planning and long range commitment to immersion in the school;

(9) inadequate monitoring of the immersion budget and program development and implementation;

(10) lack of a coordinated approach to in-service for improving development and implementation of the immersion program.

There are, of course, other interpretations to the data of this study in relation to dual-track schools. However, we have come to the conclusion that numerous dual-track programs are more a product of happenstance than design. Anyone seriously interested in immersion is urged to consider initiating strategies for improving their implementation. Particularly prográm exant within dual-track schools.

Based on the data presented in table 2.90, immersion parents are not in favour of their immersion children attending a French language secondary school where only English as a subject is taught in English. Seventy four percent of respondents either disagree or strongly disagree to this alternative. On the other hand seventy two percent of responsents agree/strongly agree that after grade eight, they would like their immersion children to proceed to a bilingual secondary school where all subjects are available in English and French and where they can elect to pursue any or all courses in the language of choice. Fewer parents (63 percent) state that they would like their immersion children to proceed to an English lánguage secondary school where several subjects (at each grade level) are available in the French language. It is worth noting that while more parents prefer a bilingual secondary school than an English language secondary school where several subjects (at each grade level) are available in French--that the former is less likely to be potentially available in the future. At the very moment when immersion parents are expressing an interest in bilingual secondary schools the provincial government is fostering insularity within the anglophone and francophone language groups in school settings. The Ontario Ministry of Education funds the creation of structures for separating anglophone and francophones at the secondary level. The existing policy is counterproductive to achieving bilingualism among anglophones during the course of their secondary school career. The existing situation raises the question of how the province plans to cope with the demands of anglophone parents who prefer a bilingual learning environment for their immersion children at the secondary school level.

It is also particularly noteworthy that immersion parents not only want their children to continue studies in French at the secondary school level but they (85 percent) agree/strongly agree that the school (secondary school) should provide whatever opportunities are required to increase French language fluency. The implication here is that it will not be sufficient to merely provide opportunities for maintaining throughout their secondary school career whatever level of fluency the children have at the end of their elementary school immersion career. Programs will be required at the secondary school career which will clearly increase their French language skill development.

The question of extending immersion to the secondary school requires close examination. For instance, bilingual secondary schools appear to becoming increasingly scarce. As well, there is some data to suggest that OSSTF is somewhat less than enthusiastic regarding extending immersion to the secondary school level.

For example, during the course of the present study and in the period immediately following grade eight graduation, it was still not clear what opportunity structures (if any) would exist for a small cohort of immersion graduates to continue achieving bilingualism during the course of their secondary school.

Suffice it to point out here that a Task Force was struck during semester two of the lead group graduating year. Its mandate was in relation to recommendations regarding French second language opportunities for the immersion graduates at the secondary school level. A variety of issues and concerns emerged during the task force process. For example, the local division of the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation submitted a brief that concluded:

> "At this time in the history of the human race when the expression "global village" accurately describes our situation in the world community, and when we find vast numbers of people rapidly moving from one continent to another, the practical value of being multi-lingual and transcultural can hardly be denied. Added to this is the obvious pressure within our own country which threatens to tear apart the fabric of national unity so that the virtue of assisting in the development of bilingual students and in the long run therefore, bilingual citizens of a multicultural

> nation, seems above question. As well, all teachers recognized the value of the increased mental stimulation produced by the learning of a second language. The Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation believes that the concept of a K to 8 French Immersion is viable and supports the present program provided by the Board of Education. Having stated the above however, the value and success of a K to 8 program of French Immersion does not necessarily imply the same value or success at the secondary level. Any extension of the present program to our Secondary Schools, therefore, must be implemented only after much careful study from a number of perspectives such as linguistic, educational and econmics."

The brief as one would expect initiated a variety of reactions. While some individuals suggested that the Teachers' Federation was responding in good faith and that it was genuinely concerned with pedagogical issues--others suggested that the federation response was in fact a self seeking stance, that it did not have a vested interest in seeing immersion extended to the high school level.

Corwin (1974) points out that change requires cooperation among organizations in order to permit them to work out new divisions of labour, new patterns of dependency, and new standards. Some critics believe that teachers' federations are a barrier to the implementation of French immersion programs in general, and in relation to their expansion to the secondary school level in particular. A task force member summarized his sentiments in the following way:

> "I've checked with other boards regarding French immersion--it seems that while individual teachers, particularly those directly involved in teaching immersion are supportive of immersion, that the different Teachers' Federations are either unresponsive or opposed to immersion...I think the

> Federations tend to take a self seeking stance when it comes to immersion...If the local division of OSSTF is concerned about linguistic and educational issues--why has it not given our parents group and the board practical assistance over the years to plan a program at the secondary level. We've been fighting the board for eight years now it looks as though we'll have to fight OSSTF as well".

Clearly, the above statements suggest that the implementation of French language immersion programs is not a smooth process. A systematic approach to these programs would alleviate many of the difficulties experienced by parents and teachers alike. The above represents two extreme outcomes (the position taken by parents and teachers). The parents on the one hand want immersion education opportunities extended to the secondary school level. Teachers on the other hand perceive these programs to be a threat to existing programmatic realities and in the final analysis their own personal security. Long range planning would be preferable to the current state of relative "non-planning". A planning process would affect somewhat the polemical rhetoric which constitutes so much of the current debate by secondary school personnel on immersion education and its merit as an opportunity structure within the secondary school experience.

There is a somewhat ambiguous, pedagogically unsound approach to the way immersion programs as an educational concept undergo implementation. Programs appear to get adopted and implemented without the benefit of a clear image as to what the programs should look like in practice and selective strategies to ensure that requisite practices actually evolve.

On the whole, it seems that the predicated situation, i.e., for boards to adopt a course of action in responde to parental pressure and for teachers and their federations to become complacent after initial resistance. The positive relationships between parents, boards and teachers that one would expect - do not appear to emerge, at least not initially.

When implementating an educational innovation such as a French language immersion program, parents and teachers should be able to rely on boards being actively involved in planning with continuity along the educational continuum in mind. This is essential in order to ensure that the programs conforms to sound principles of curriculum organization. The proceeding statements express the concerns of parents and teachers. They also provide an indication of the nature and scope of parental involvement that is required to sustain these programs. The data also suggest that educational institutions and professional teachers may in a way be an appendage to the implementation process, rather than committed to a leadership role with respect to the direction immersion programs take over the course of time.

This raises the question of the extent to which boards and teacher federations should be reasonably expected to play a leadership role with respect to French language immersion education. One gets the impression that while parents appear to be least effective in pressuring boards to mount immersion programs and to extend them from one grade level to the next -

that the entire process is rather ad hoc. The most that can be expected from this approach is that the programs will achieve some type of results. The overall process is however, not consistent with sound principles of curriculum organization or effective program implementation.

In recent years, boards have had a tendency to be rather complacent regarding the implementation of immersion programs. The impacts of this approach are immense. Contrary to the beliefs of immersion teachers and principals the programs are not capable of conforming to sound principlesof curriculum organization involving continuity, integration, and sequencing. As well, this approach is a prime determinant of the types of factors which affect these programs throughout the entire implementation process. Rather than facilitating strategies for coping with problems of implementation, the approach raises the ire of teachers, principals and parents alike; causes hostility within the community, and encourages school based personnel to become experts in the science of impression management.

Teachers, principals and parents are not oblivious to the problems created by the existing approach to program development and implementation. They are well aware that all too frequently, attempts to improve existing situations are frequently ad hoc, piecemeal and in the final analysis, too little - too late.

To boards, we urge long range planning! To teachers, we urge a commitment to achieving bilingualism in education! To parents we urge you not to give up the battle!

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction: Limits to Our Interpretations

Reaching conclusions in policy research is often a tenuous business. In this report, recommendations reflect the researchers' analysis of the data as well as a sense of what will optimize programs. Thus, many of our recommendations address how programs ought to function; they are not merely empirical descriptions of how they do operate and hence are not strictly "objective". We believe, however, that we have (1) made explicit our rationales for recommendations; (2) specified the links between our recommendations and our data bases; and (3) made available the nature of our data bases and methodologies.

One person's paradise is another's inferno. We do not ask that everyone agree with all our findings(one can hope). We do hope that reviewing our methodological bases will aid both adherents and detractors in understanding precisely what it is that we have done.

3.2. Principle of Triangulation

Following Denzin (1970) and others (Westie, 1957; Webb, 1966), we have tried to assemble our data using the principle of "triangulation". This involves assembling multiple data sources and trying to assess the consistency of findings across those varying methodological modalities. Types of methodologies we used included: (1) literature search, (2) assembling of archival data, (3) conducting limited ethnographics, (4) administering structured interviews (including pre-tests), (5) survey data, (6) use of key informants, and (7) statistical findings.

3.3. Literature Search and Coordination with other Studies

In preparation for the study, the researchers conducted an extensive literature search, which included computerized (ERIC/EISO) searches for materials on French Immersion. In addition to familiarizing ourselves with findings in the literature on French Immersion, we coordinated our interview schedules and questionnaires with several existing studies. These included our own French Immersion study conducted by Sharon Lapkin and Jim Cummings as well as a study by Peter Evans for the Sudbury Board. Each of these individuals is at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE). In addition, we constructed a variety of our questions to be compatible with a survey conducted for the Calgary Board of Education. Our aim in collating our survey with others was to provide an easy comparison baseline between our findings and those of other researchers. Our preliminary forms were also critiqued by Professors Raymond Mougeon, Norman Frenette, Sharon Lapkin, Merrill Swain, Ross Traub, Jim Cummings and Michael Fullan of OISE. We wish to express our gratitude for their valuable comments. Errors and omissions in our work, are of course, our own responsibility.

3.4. Uses of Archival Data

In preparing our questionnaire, we used a series of archival type data. Specifically, these included federal policy guidelines on transfer grants; Ontario Ministry of Education policy guidelines on French language learning; press clippings from local newspapers about French Immersion programs. This review was designed to acquaint us with (1) official policy statements, goals and guidelines; (2) group views about French Immersion (e.g., parents, community groups, teachers federations, etc.); and (3) how and where French Immersion had become a source of controversy (e.g., in local media or public forums, such as board meetings).

3.5. Use of Informants and Pretest

Prior to conducting systematic interviews and surveys, we had numerous discussions and conducted numerous interviews with our key informants; these included members of the Board of Education, directors of education, principals, parents of children in French Immersion classes, fellow teachers, French Immersion and non-Immersion teachers and members of both the Anglophone and Francophone community. Measures were taken to try to insure "optimal flow" of the questionnaire (Oppenheim, 1966).

When we were uncertain about a claim made by an informant, we would repeat the claim to other individuals, including those who share the informant's role and those who did not. If opinions varied widely on an issue, we employed multiple items which enabled us to assess various individuals' responses. We tried to include perceptual as well as objective items, so as to be able to make reliable and valid checks (McCall and Simmons, 1969, Loffland, 1971).

When our initial set of concerns had been defined and our questionnaires constructed, we conducted various informal pre-tests. Our intentions were (1) to insure that questions were intelligible; (2) to ferret out awkward points, misspelling, etc., and (3) to estimate the manageability of our surveys. In short, we sought to insure (1) testability, (2) that we had employed clear and unambiguous language, (3) that our work parsimoniously captured the conceptual, social and implementation issues we sought to address (Bellitz, et al, 1976; Bailey, 1978). Again, our pre-tests(s) were conducted on various constituencies (e.g., parents, teachers, principals, students).

3. 6. Methods of Entry, Assurances of Confidentiality and Ethical Considerations

Our methods of entry, following Schatzman and Strauss (1973), proceeded in a "top down manner". We gained permission from each successive administrative layer, explaining our intent, techniques and goals to individuals involved. All this was done prior to gathering data.

Our entry procedures commenced with gaining approval for research from directors of education and boards. Next, we worked with principals with regard to scheduling and implementation. Finally, we worked with teachers who aided us in administering the questionnaires to students above the Grade 6 level. In addition, teachers had their students take questionnaires (in sealed envelopes) home to their parents.

Throughout our study, we took rigorous measures to insure complete confidentiality to boards, administrators, teachers, parents and students. We explained our policy on confidentiality to all constituents of the school hierarchy and in no case (to our knowledge) was this confidentiality violated. Our aim in reporting was and is to examine the policy issues-- and not the performance or the views of individuals involved.

We believe ethics dictate that our primary responsibility is to honour our commitment of confidentiality to those we studied (Erickson, 1967). The researchers welcome review of their data by other serious researchers, given that the confidentiality of those cooperating with us in our study is respected. Scholarly critiques of our methods and findings are, of course, both proper and welcome. Our data is not available for other purposes, such as a review of the program or an evaluation of the individuals involved.

3.7. Design, Sampling and Administration of Interviews and Questionnaires

The design and sampling procedures employed in our study were simplified by the fact that we reached every individual in our target population and did not have to rely on statistics (Blalock, 1970; Hay, 1963; Mendenhall et al, 1971). Our teacher interviews reached not only every French Immersion teacher listed by the Ministry and the boards of education (eight in all), but also several de facto French Immersion teachers in French Language Schools who were not listed in official publications.

Similarly, our principal interviews reached the principal in each Immersion school. In addition, several informal interviews (not included in our data) were carried out in schools where "core" French was taught in order to provide contrast with responses from French Immersion principals. Parent questionnaires were sent home with children and which were either sealed and returned to teachers, to be collected by the researchers, or were mailed directly to the researchers. Covering letters explained the questionnaire (see Appendix C). Student questionnaires were given in class to all students above the Grade 6 level. The Grade 6 level was chosen somewhat arbitrarily; the researchers thought that younger children might give unstable responses and/or misunderstand the concepts.

We most comprehensively interviewed principals and teachers because we judged them to be the key change and implementation agents in the program. Interviews were both structured and in questionnaire form (Selltiz, et al, 1976; Philips, 1976). All interviews were conducted by a principal investigator. Interviews were generally in English; in several cases, at the request of the interviewees, they were in French. Interviewees were also given a questionnaire to fill out.

Interviewers were instructed to be as "neutral" as possible in answering interviewees' questions, in probing them for more information and in noting qualitative kinds of factors (e.g., ambiguities, personal observations, etc.) that came up in the interview. Teachers were also asked to take note of such qualitative factors. This qualitative data was subsequently compiled and evaluated by the researchers.

Interviews were lengthy--generally three to four solid hours. Boards and schools provided supply teachers to cover for teachers during their interviews. Interviews were always conducted in private.

3.8. Responses Rates to Interviews and Questionnaires

Our response rates from principal and teachers were ideal. We reached all (100%) of the French Immersion teachers and principals in all of the boards (see Table 3.1).

Our response rates to student and parent questionnaires were also unusually high (see Table 3.2). Student response rates averaged 93% and parent response rates 80%.

Several clarifications regarding relationships in Tables 3.1 and 3.2 may be in order. The initial identifying number indicates the district; the number after the decimal indicates the school. Various schools and districts do not

Table 3.1 Completed Interview Schedules by School Code & Status of Respondent

School Code	Principal (N)	Teacher (N)	Others (N)	Total
1.0	1	8	0	9
1.1	1	1	0	2
1.2	1	1	0	2
2.0	2	2	0	4
3.0	1	1	0	2
3.1	1	5	0	6
4.0	1	4	1	6
5.0	1	8	0	9
5.1	1	1	0	2
6.0	1	5	0	6
6.1	1	10	0	11
6.2	1	1	0	2
7.0	0	0	0	0
8.0	1	1	0	2
8.1	1	2	0	3
8.2	1	1	0	2
8.3	1	1	0	2
9.0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	17	52	1	70

Note 1: Data were not collected for schools coded 7.0 and 9.0, although they were included in our population of schools with French Immersion programs. During all phases of our project, the directors of education and the two principals involved with these schools maintained that the schools did not have French Immersion programs. On the other hand, teachers informed us that French Immersion did exist. We elected not to press the matter.

2: School (5.1) was found not to have French Immersion. However, we did collect data on its oral French program.

3: Numbers reported here are not identical with numbers found in tables. The principals and teachers not missing from the tables were interviewed but were in schools not claiming to have French Immersion. They were therefore not coded in the statistical tabulations.

TABLE 3.2 Numerical Distribution of French Immersion Families (All Grades) and Immersion Students (Grades 6, 7 & 8), and Numerical/Percentage Completed Questionnaires by School

	Immersion Students in Gr.6,7,8			Immersion Families (JK-Gr. 8)		
School Code	Enrolment N	Completed Questionnaires (N)	% Return	N	Completed Questionnaires (N)	% Return
1.0	58	52	90	186	118	63
1.1	7	7	100	7	4	57
1.2	7	6	86	7	6	86
2.0*	0	0	0	32	27	84
3.0	13	12	92	13	12	92
3.1	0	0	0	74	67	91
4.0	0	0	0	60	46	77
5.0*	0	0	0	136	98	72
5.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
6.0	0	0	0	64	50	78
6.1	24	22	92	175	127	73
6.2	23	22	96	20	17	85
7.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
8.0	26	25	96	26	25	96
8.1	68	45	96	38	29	75
8.2	18	16	89	18	16	89
8.3	131	86	95	-	-	-
9.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	266	247	93	818	613	80

*All other schools are dual-track schools in which English is the main language of communication. Schools assigned an asterisk are dual-track schools in which French is the main language of communication.

have students above the Grade 5 level. This explains the "0's" in 2.0, 3.1, 5.0, 6.0 of the student section. We were unable to conduct student or parent interviews in schools 5.1, 7.0 and 9.0 because the school's official policy is that French Immersion does not exist in the schools (see Appendix A). In respect for the school's official policy, we did not conduct questionnaires in these areas.

3.9. Use of Ethnography

During our study we attempted to use ethnography and qualitative data as extensively as possible (Schateman and Strauss, 1973; Filstead, 1970; Bogden and Taylor, 1975). We participated not only in various French Immersion class settings, but observed and talked with children in schoolyards. We discussed immersion with numerous members of both the French and English communities. We actively interviewed teachers and parents in the French and English system and actively sought out those with strong views on immersion. We used various informants to "try out" propositions on various persons in school and community settings. Often we would discuss French Immersion with various community members to elicit their views and knowledge of the program. In general, we "immersed" ourselves as much as possible in the life of the communities studied, trying to become aware of local conditions, politics, personalities, histories and idiosyncrasies of the educational system, the immersion program and the community context. We believe this information aided us in distinguishing between effects attributable to local particularities and those of more general derivation.

3.10. Reliability and Validity

Various checks were taken to insure the reliability and validity of the interviews and questionnaires. Both interviews and questionnaires contained similar items, the responses to which were counter-directionalized so that yea-saying could be checked by techniques of split-half validity (Bohrnstedt, 1969). Questions were scaled using a variety of approaches (Bauer, 1966 and Blalock, 1968) so that the range and magnitude of responses could be tested. Multiple items were included for key conceptual issues so that scale and composite indexes could be constructed (Baily, 1978). Care was taken to insure that instructions given to students and parents were uniform. The identity of interviewers, schools and districts was coded so that systematic bias could be tested. Confidentiality and uniformity of interview style was achieved. Various demographic information was included so that statistical techniques (X^2, t-test, analysis of variance, cross tabulation) could be applied to test hypotheses.

The nature of our sampling was such that we worked with parameters in the subjects we studied. While our questionnaires may have elicited biases or invalid responses due to their construction, the population we studied provided us with a representative validity in that it encompassed the worlds of both teachers and parents. Moreover, we asked all respondents (especially teachers and principals) to note any biases they believed to be occurring concerning questions or the interview itself.

3.11. Statistical Analysis

Overall, the statistical analysis used in this report was descriptive rather than inferential (Blalock, 1972), mostly consisting of reporting simple percentages. Occasional cross-tabulations were calculated for the researcher's own use. The data set was constructed so that scaling and more complex inferential hypothesis testing is possible (Rosenberg, 1968); this will probably be carried out by the researchers at a future date. Results will be made available to involved boards and interested persons.

What would be interesting, but beyond the scope of this study, would be to correlate socio-demographic data with achievement and IQ data. One could then test competing models of performance and achievement in the French Immersion cohort classes as opposed to other classes. This would give one not only a more objective grasp of the effects and forces in French Immersion, but a truly valid assessment of the degree to which achievement is due to program effects and the degree to which it is due to exogenous factors or co-variants, such as class background, IQ and so on. To our knowledge, data analysis of this type is rare. Most evaluations of program performance are conjectural for most of the variables involved remain confounded and obscure, viz., the various causal determinants of performance; the interaction effects (Rosenberg, 1968); the spurious effects of suppressive variables and so on (see Trites and Price, 1977).

In our analysis of educational performance, based on match-pairing French Immersion dropouts with those remaining in the program, we found those still in the program as opposed to those who had dropped out had higher IQ's; socio-economic status; more schooling prior to Grade 1; developed reading sub-skills more rapidly; spoke at an earlier age; and both watched and comprehended more French TV programs. Trites and Price attribute these variations to neurological and maturational factors; based on our own analysis we suggest a counter hypothesis: namely, what they may be measuring as biological differences are in fact differences of selection such that there is a skewing in social class and family support background, IQ and other causal factors which make social and not biological factors of selection the key causal determinants of observed performance.

3.12. Coding and Key Punching

Coding was carried out by coders trained by the researchers and keypunching was done by professional key punching services. Validity checks were done on all key punching.

Coding of socio-economic status followed the classifications carried out by Pineo-Porter for Canadian populations. Income level data were checked against Statistics Canada (1978) and other data (DEPO, 1979). Missing data were coded separately from questions where the respondent "didn't know" or where the respondent refused to answer. Other codebooks, codes and coding procedures used by the researchers are available from the researchers upon request.

Demographics of the Various Cohorts

3.13.1 Teachers

Teachers in the French Immersion programs we studied tended overwhelmingly to be Roman Catholic. Forty-one of 48 teachers listed themselves as having a Roman Catholic religious preference, five listed "no preference"; "Protestant" and "other" each had one response. As well, teachers tended to be married (see Table 3.3).

Table 3.3

Marital Status of French Immersion Teachers

	%
Single	27
Married	69
Separated	4
	100

N = 48

They are also overwhelming female (Table 3.4).

Table 3.4

Sex of French Immersion Teachers

	%
Male	10
Female	90
	100

N = 48

In general, they tend to be young, with over half being between the ages of 25 and 35; none were over 56 (see Table 3.5).

Table 3.5

Age Range of French Immersion Teachers

	%
Age under 25	19
25-29	29
30-35	27
36-39	13
40-44	8
45-49	0
50-55	4
56 or older	0
	100

N = 48

Their income levels ranged from \$5,000 to \$10,000 to \$45,000 plus. The mean, median, and modes were all in the \$15-20,000 bracket, with a standard error of .2.

Teachers varied in their types of educational backgrounds. Forty-four percent (N=48) had done their educational work in French; 29% had done their work in English; 12% had done bilingual work and the rest either did not respond or took some other form of training. About 1 in 5 had an advanced degree (e.g., Masters in Education) and about 1 in 20 had some other form of advanced degree (e.g., M.A.; M.A.T.; Ed.D; Ph.D.). The general pattern by which the majority of teachers had obtained their Ministry of Education Teaching Certificate was to proceed directly to Teachers'

College after high school. The only other common certification pattern (for about 1 in 5) was to go to a faculty of education with an elementary school certification.

We respect and welcome both individuality and diversity. Still, gaining a statistical profile can shed light on general trends. In this regard, our ideal-typical French Immersion teacher, from a demographic and statistical vantage point, is female, married, between 25 and 35; she is a Roman Catholic francophone with an undergraduate degree in education; she attended Teachers' College right after high school. Her salary is in the $15,000 to $20,000 range.

To all you male, single, older, Protestant, Anglophone Ph.D.'s earning over $45,000 who may be in our sample (or who may vary from our profile in one way or another), we believe that you are there; you are (for better or worse) just not ideal-typical.

3.13.2 Principal Cohort

Principals, of course, were our smallest sample. The modal category for religious preference of the principals in our study was Protestant. (see Table 3.6).

Table 3.6

Principals Religious Preference

	%
Protestant	50
Catholic	31
Islamic	6
None	13
	100

N = 16

The principals were generally male (Table 3.7) and married (Table 3.8).

Table 3.7

Sex of Principals

	%
Male	75
Female	25
	100

N = 16

Table 3.8

Marital Status of Principals

	%
Single	13
Married	81
Separated/Divorced	6
Widow	0
	100

N = 16

Their ages tended to be older than teachers we interviewed; the mean, median and mode for this group was in the 40-50 year-old range (Table 3.9).

Salary ranges for principals were heavily clustered in the $30 to $40,000 range with 81% of our principals in this range. Principals' means, medians and modes were all in the $30 to $35,000 range (Table 3.10).

Table 3.9

Age Ranges for Principals

	%
Under 25	0
25-29	0
30-34	6
35-39	13
40-44	31
45-49	19
50-55	19
56 and older	6
Missing	6
	100

N = 16

Table 3.10

Salary Ranges for Principals

	%
$20-24	6
25-29	6
30-34	50
35-39	31
40-45	6
	99%*

N = 16

*due to round off errors

Seventy-five percent of all principals had done their college work in English. The rest had either done their work in French or in both French and English. Twenty-seven percent had some post-graduate work (generally an M.Ed.). Sixty-seven percent had only a B.A. degree, or an equivalent, and none of the principals in our sample had had doctoral level work. Ninety-four percent (15 of 16) had entered

Teachers' College directly after high school to get their Ministry of Education teaching certificates. Eighty-one percent of the principals had done this in English, while 19% had done this in French. More, therefore, were technically trained as educators in mid-career.

Both our cohorts of principals and teachers tend to meet stereotypical and statistical profiles of the discipline: the teachers are generally female, younger, less well-paid and slightly more eclectic in their educational backgrounds. Undoubtedly, because of the special demands of French Immersion, they tend to be Catholic and Francophone in background. The principals who supervise them tend to be male, Protestant and older, better paid, unilingual Anglophones whose own education background was very directly linked to a specific career in education.

3.13.3 THE PARENT COHORT

3.13.3.1 Occupational Status of the Parents

If one examines the occupational prestige status of parents in French Immersion, their scores as measured on the Pineo-Porter scale tend to be clustered within the middle status ranges. Seventy six percent were in these middle ranges, while twelve percent were found in the highest and lowest occupational ranges. "Low" and "high" are operationally defined in our study by 1) the first two hundred and 2) the last two hundred on the Pineo-Porter scale respectively.

This pattern is about normal for the entire Ontario population. However, it is high by Northern Ontario standards. One problem we encountered in using Pineo-Porter (or Blishen's alternative) is that these scored norms are defined against national (i.e., southern) standards. In the south, a miner, teacher, or shop keeper may be regarded as middle status persons; but in Northern communities these type of occupations (along with professional class persons) often form the core of their communities "upper" social structure. Our observations about French immersion lead us to believe the patterns in these Northern working class communities conform closely to data reported by the Hamilton Board in Southern Ontario (HBERS, 1976): While French Immersion programs contained more working class background children than in other Southern Ontario boards they contain virtually all the professional class people in the community. These professional classes are also backed by a substantial group of interested parents from other middle occupational prestige groups. What this means as lived experience is that virtually all the doctors, lawyers, dentist and other professions have their children in immersion (or more accurately, are heavily over represented) and they are joined by the children of local shop merchants, union stewarts and other persons active in the community. Therefore, *relative* to their *own* community standards they are elite. This is a pattern which will also hold educational background variable. In income, however, the parents are elite even by national standards and are especially elite by community norms. What should, of course, be done to gain an accurate indicator of Northern community norms is to recalculate Pineo-Porter and Blishen to Northern Canadian standards. Our personal as well as collective knowledge in the literature about the North is sufficient to suggest nonetheless, that to find a Northern cohort that matches Southern norms is unusually high for its own communities' standards (Lukas, 1971).

3.13.3.2 *Education Levels of Parents*

Analysis of the education levels of French Immersion parents again yields a pattern of elitism *compared to community norms*. For example, in the education self report section 83% had finished high school (table Ministry Reports (M.O.E. 1980a) suggest that in these communities up to 50% of the general population has *not* finished high school. Also among the self report group for education, 22% reported a B.A. or better as their educational background. These figures are high even by

Table 3.11

Education Levels of French Immersion Parents

	Self	Spouse
No school	1	6
Grade school	4	8
High school	47	44
Community College/ CEGEP	14	12
B.A.	17	14
Postgraduate	5	5
Other	10	9
Missing/no response	3	3
	101*	101*

N = 592

*due to round off error

Southern Ontario standards (Harvey, 1974) while the education levels are not as skewed as income and are not as great as in reports in the literature about Southern Ontario data suggest exist for French Immersion (see bibliography) they are still high both compared to national and particularily Northern Ontario norms.

12.3.3.3 Income Levels of Parents

Parents income levels and ranges reflected more diversity than did either the teachers or principals: persons were found both in the lowest category ($5000 and less per year) and in the highest category ($55,000) gross family income per year. The standard deviations and standard errors for the parent cohort were correspondingly greater than in either the principals, and teacher populations.

The median income level (1980) was in the twenty-five to thirty thousand range; the mode is in the thirty to thirty-five thousand range; and the mean is probably safely somewhere between twenty-five and thirty-five thousand dollars per year - (see table_ gross family income. Half the children come from homes where the gross family income was over $30,000 per year. Only four percent came from families earning under $10,000 per year. bhis compares with Statistics Canada data for 1978* where 16.4% of the population in non-standard metropolitan areas of Ontario earned in the seven to nine thousand dollar a year range or less and thirty percent earned a gross family income of $25,000 or more per annum (Statistics Canada, 1978).

---

* 1978 Data was the most recent Statistics Canada data available. Levels for percentage have been reduced approximately by the inflation rate in intervening years. Table percentages were for gross family incomes in non-metropolitan areas of Ontario. The low income level cut point for the 1978 figures was $7747 (Statistics Canada, 1978, p. 25). We project that approximately $10,000 would be a corresponding cut point in 1980. If our assumptions are correct, this suggests less than one in twenty of our French Immersion children came from low income backgrounds.

Table 3.12

Parental Income Levels

	%
$ 0 - 488	2
5,000 - 9,999	2
10,000 - 14,999	7
15,000 - 19,999	11
20,000 - 24,999	18
25,000 - 29,000	15
30,000 - 34,999	19
35,000 - 39,999	4
40,000 - 44,999	3
45,000 - 49,999	3
50 or more	5
No answer	11
N = 592	100%

S.D. = 29.145

S.E. = 1.192

These average salaries are very impressive indeed when compared to norms of the community. In our population sample the regional mean* for gross family income for 1979 was $10,899.

---

* Figures for 1979 (last year available) were computed for us by Len Koskistalo, Ministry of Treasury and Economics, Toronto. Data will be available when Revenue Canada releases its document "Taxation Statistics" (1979). We wish to express our gratitude to Mr. Koskitoslo for providing us with accurate base lines for comparison.

The lowest community mean gross family income for a community in our study was around $5200; the highest was 11,200. While the Ontario Ministry of Treasury and Economics data is for 1979 while our data is for 1980, we find it incomprehensible that differences of income levels on the order of magnitutude of two for three times the community means for gross family income can be interpreted as anything but reflecting the very elite positions of French Immersion parents compared to their communities.

Analysis of the non-respondents (11%) also warrants attention. Inspection of the cross tabulation of data on non-respondents to income levels for their occupation status of parents suggests that non-respondents to the income question could be classed in one of two types: 1) they had higher SES backgrounds, or 2) they tended to be in vocations associated with self-employed small businesses. What each of these types suggests to us is that non-respondents are not likely to have lower actual incomes than respondents.

Age Distribution of Parents

The range of ages of parents responding to their questionnaire was twenty to sixty-six years of age. The ages reported by respondents had a mean of 35; a median of 24; and a mode of 33. For spouses the mean was thirty-eight; the median thirty-six and the mode was again thirty-three. Parents are therefore generally in their middle thirties.

3.13.3.4 Religious Preference of Parents

Parents were overwhelmingly and predictably Christian with Protestant the modal category (48%), with Roman Catholics as the second largest group (34%).

Table 3.13

Religious Preference of Parents

	%
Protestant	48
Roman Catholic	34
Other	8
None	6
No response/missing	3
	99*

N = 592

* due to round off error

3.13.3.5 Parental Summary

The ideal typical French Immersion parent in our study is Protestant, has middle range educational and occupational prestige levels, is in their middle 30's, married and still living with their spouses, and is very much in the upper income strata of their country and community. Their reasons for entering their children in French Immersion are directly tied to individual aspirations they hold for their child's personal, vocational and cultural opportunities.

Chapter 4

RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Partners in the Advancement of Immersion Education

It is very important that whatever research is undertaken in applied settings that it produce results in a form that can be directly, as far as possible, used by decision makers. We believe that several different jurisdictions have equally important roles to play in relation to improving the implementation of extended and French-language immersion programs. It has been evident throughout this study that the federal government, the Ministry of education, trustees, directors of education, teachers and their federations, and parents alike are all partners to the implementation of French-language immersion education. The following paragraphs will provide brief recommendations on important roles of the above jurisdictions.

Our recommendations are that:

4.2 The Federal Government

(a) Establish data banks to monitor who receives what type of French language education, and in what amounts.

(b) Continue to support programs for achieving bilingualism in education.

(c) Consider a series of weighted funding formulas for programs which
(i) are known to be successful,
(ii) require ongoing development and implementation and
(iii) are implementing policies in keeping with stated funding goals.

4.3 Boards, Directors, Principals

A Develop and implement plans to actively recruit students from all social class and types of backgrounds into French Immersion.

B Work with teachers, unions and ministry to plan manpower redeployments caused by expansion of French Immersion.

C Put in-service training and consultation in place on a systematic basis.

D Establish guidelines strictly regulating the grounds under which a child may be excluded from French Immersion.

E Develop and implement better long range plans for the ongoing development and implementation of French Immersion including specific commitments to the program viability over a series of years and grade levels.

F To develop guidelines for the spending of funds earmarked for immersion education and monitor the way funds are divided between "on line" and administrative support service to insure the greatest possible funds reach direct classroom services such as books instructional materials, and in-service training.

G Require teachers and principals to undertake special training in French Immersion.

H Play a leadership role with respect to the implementation of French Immersion programs.

I Insure that library and other support facilities in French and English are available to immersion children are at a level comparable to regular English stream classes.

4.4 Parents

A Pressure boards to make a commitment to the principle of long range planning regarding immersion education.

B Monitor how funds are spent to insure that extra monies for French Immersion education are spent primarily for direct classroom service.

C Ensure that decisions made in connection with immersion education are made on pedagogical and not political grounds.

D Work with teacher and community groups to try to alleviate problems and worries around the program.

E Try to get guarantees from boards about program length and where, for how long, and at what level of support the programs will be maintained.

4.5 Teachers and Teachers Federation

A Request more and better in-service training.

B Argue for the development and implementation of retraining and manpower redeployment plans now, before dislocation occurs.

C Work with boards and ministry to establish guide lines and minimal standards for French Immersion teaching.

D Work to insure that principals who supervise French Immersion are trained to have knowledge of the program's operation.

4.6 Ministry of Education

A Continue to facilitate French Immersion programs.

B Dramatically increase in-service training for French Immersion for teachers and principals.

C Develop and publish long range plans and guidelines for curriculum and implementation of Immersion programs.

D Continue to develop and put in place the best curriculum material available into the classrooms on French Immersion. Develop "circular 14" type lists of approved resources.

E Require special training of French Immersion teachers and principals.

F Increase funding as needed to ensure that services and resources (especially libraries) in support of immersion are equal to those available in support of regular programs.

G Provide guidelines on recruitment practices, and the specific conditions under which a child may be excluded from an immersion program.

H Allocate personnel in the regional offices with designated responsibility in monitoring the implementation of French Immersion programs.

I Develop specific and detailed guidelines for French Immersion as has been done with core French learning.

J Monitor how transfer money is spent to insure that these funds are used for materials and in-service directly in support of classroom learning.

K Begin to work with teachers federations and faculties of education to plan manpower redeployment and training of teachers for French Immersion.

L Establish guidelines to insure that where possible the "neighborhood school" concept and parental wishes (and not local politics) will prevail in deciding where schools are located and/or which schools are closed.

M Create funds, where necessary, for extra facilities and support personnel to insure every child who wishes French Immersion learning has a space and that adequate remedial help is available to realistically allow children to stay in these programs.

4.7 The Role of the Principal, the Classroom Teacher and In-Service Training

Parenthetically, one of the most neglected areas in education is in relation to the effective use of in-service as a strategy for improving the implementation of educational innovations. Based on our observations, the institutionalization of in-service for the professional development of immersion teachers and immersion principals for the development of implementation expertise would improve the implementation of immersion programs.

By implementation expertise we mean for example that principals would possess whatever knowledge, skills, and affects are required to play a leadership role with respect to managing the ongoing development and implementation of immersion programs in school settings and teachers would possess whatever knowledge, skills and affects are required to implement changes in the classroom.

More specifically what follows are clearly defined roles for principals, teachers and in-service. While we appreciate that boards are required to concentrate on certain selective priorities, we recommend institutionalization of the functions outlined in sections 4.8, 4.9 and 4.10.

4.8 The Role of the Principal

The curriculum functions of the Principal regarding Bilingual Education (French Immersion) can be clarified in relation to five key elements: educational goals, implementation tasks (obstacles and strategies), timing and monitoring, personnel, and finance. The role of the principal in the context of each element is as follows:

A Goals

To develop a statement of school goals re Bilingual Education (French Immersion) and develop processes to communicate these to classroom teachers.

To implement processes within the school for the continual interpretation of curriculum goals with Bilingual Education (French Immersion) teachers.

To provide leadership with respect to coordination of activities for utilizing Ministry of Education and Board curriculum documents for achieving Bilingual Education (French Immersion) curriculum goals of the school.

B Implementation Tasks, Obstacles and Strategies

To provide leadership and encouragement to Bilingual Education (French Immersion) teachers in curriculum development and implementation projects.

To develop school priorities, plans, and activities with Bilingual Education (French Immersion) teachers for initiating curriculum innovation practices, needed materials and program review.

To plan for teacher release time, scheduling etc. to allow groups of Bilingual Education (French Immersion) teachers to interact.

To be aware of the Bilingual Education (French Immersion) courses of study used within the school, and to provide for their effective utilization.

To be aware of a variety of methods for achieving curriculum objectives of Bilingual Education (French Immersion) and to assist teachers in their selection and use.

C Timing and Monitoring

To set timelines for Ministry of Education and Board Bilingual Education (French Immersion) curriculum documents to be implemented in the school.

To establish agreement with Bilingual Education (French Immersion) teachers on information assessment system regarding program review, implementation and intended student learning outcomes.

To monitor the development and implementation of Bilingual Education (French Immersion) program in the school.

D Personnel

To identify possible internal to school personnel to assist in the development and implementation of the Bilingual Education (French Immersion) program.

E. Finance

To plan with the teachers budget allocation for materials, release time, resource people, etc.

To establish a school budget in support of the ongoing development, implementation, and evaluation of the schools' Bilingual Education (French-language immersion) program(s).

To be aware of Board budget allocation for materials, release time, resource people etc. in support of the ongoing development, implementation, and evaluation of Bilingual Education (French-language immersion program(s).

To be aware of and access multiple resources for funding functions and activities.

4.9 The Role of the Classroom Teacher

The curriculum functions of the Bilingual Education (French Immersion) classroom teacher can be clarified in relation to five key elements: Bilingual Education (French Immersion) goals, implementation tasks (obstacles and strategies), timing and monitoring, personnel and finance. The role of the Bilingual Education (French Immersion) classroom teacher in a Board in the context of each element is as follows;

A Goals

To identify new materials for achieving curriculum goals within the Bilingual Education (French Immersion) classroom situation.

To identify new teaching approaches (including requisite skills) for achieving curriculum goals within the Bilingual Education (French Immersion) classroom situation.

To identify new beliefs (images of the learner and the classroom teaching environment) implicit in curriculum innovation intended to achieve the curricula goals of Bilingual Education (French Immersion) within the classroom.

B Implementation Tasks, Obstacles and Strategies

To be aware of and knowledgeable about Ministry of Education Guidelines and support documents applicable to the Bilingual Education (French Immersion) classroom siguation.

To be aware of and knowledgeable about Board curriculum documents applicable to the Bilingual Education (French Immersion) classroom situation.

To be actively involved in teacher-teacher and teacher-principal planning for curriculum development, curriculum implementation, professional development, program assessment etc. regarding the Bilingual Education (French Immersion) program.

To assess current student needs and performance within the Bilingual Education (French Immersion) program.

C Timing and Monitoring

To implement change in the Bilingual Education (French Immersion) classroom.

To initiate a procedure for monitoring progress in implementing curriculum changes in the Bilingual Education (French Immersion) classroom.

To assess progress in achieving intended student performance in the Bilingual Education (French Immersion) program.

To feedback (share with) to the principal information concerning problems of implementation regarding the Bilingual Education (French Immersion) program.

D Personnel

To participate with fellow classroom teachers and school principal to identify and access external to the school materials for achieving curriculum goals of the Bilingual Education (French Immersion) program.

To participate with fellow classroom teachers and the school principal to identify and access external to the school resource personnel to assist in the implementation of the Bilingual Education (French Immersion) program.

E Finance

To plan with the principal budget allocation for instructional materials, release time, resource people etc. in support of developing and implementing the Bilingual Education (French Immersion) curriculum.

4.10 The Purpose of In-Service

The curriculum related purposes of In-Service with respect to Bilingual Education (French Immersion) programs can be clarified in relation to five key elements: Bilingual Education (French Immersion) goals, implementation tasks (obstacles and strategies), timing and monitoring, personnel, and finance. The purpose of In-Service in a Board of Education in the context of each element is as follows:

A Goals

To ensure the coordination and development of resources (information and personnel) to support curriculum development/adaptation, curriculum implementation and program assessment initiatives for achieving Bilingual Education (French Immersion) policy goals.

B Implementation Tasks, Obstacles and Strategies

To provide principals and classroom teachers of Bilingual Education (French Immersion) programs with resource support (both human and material) for developing curriculum development, implementation and program assessment expertise.

To provide principals and classroom teachers of Bilingual Education (French Immersion) programs with resource support (both personnel and programs) for coping with problems of curriculum development, implementation and program assessment.

C Timing and Monitoring

To be aware of resource personnel (including people from the Ministry, Faculties of Education, OTF, Local Boards, OAEAO, OISE etc.) available for professional development days and coordinate their use in support of curriculum development, implementation and evaluation initiatives at the system and school levels regarding Bilingual Education (French Immersion) programs.

To coordinate the availability of Bilingual Education (French Immersion) program review teams to assess implementation and provide follow through support applicable to the school and school system.

D **Personnel**

To implement processes to identify personnel within the Provincial and Regional Office of the Ministry of Education, Faculties of Education, OISE, OTF, OAEAO etc. having professional development expertise in relation to curriculum development and program assessment issues relating to Bilingual Education (French Immersion) initiatives.

E **Finance**

To access multiple resources for funding In-Service activities in relation to achieving Bilingual Education (French Immersion) program objectives.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andrew, C.M., Lapkin, S. & Swain, M. Report on the 1979 Evaluation of a French Immersion Program and Extended French Program in the Toronto Board of Education, Grades 5-8. Toronto, OISE, 1980.

__________. Report on the 1978 Evaluation of the Ottawa and Carleton French Immersion Programs, Grades 5-7. Toronto: OISE, 1979a. (mimeo.)

__________. Report on the 1979 Evaluation of the Ottawa and Carleton Early French Immersion Programs, Grades 6 & 8. Toronto: OISE, 1980.

Apple, Michael. Ideology and Curriculum. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.

Baily, K. Methods of Social Research, New York, The Free Press, 1978.

Barik, H.C., & Swain, M. Three Year Evaluation of a Large Scale Early Grade French Immersion Program: The Ottawa Study. Language Learning, 1975 (25 (1), 1-30.

__________. French Immersion in Canada: The Ottawa Study through Grade Four. ITL, A Review of Applied Linguistics, 1977, 36, 45-70.

__________. Evaluation of a French Immersion Program: The Ottawa Study through Grade Five. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 1978a, 10 (3), 192-201.

__________. Evaluation of a Bilingual Education Program in Canada: The Elgin Study through Grade Six. Acts of the Colloquium of the Swet's Inter-University Commission for Applied Linguistics. CILA Bulletin No. 27.

__________. Bilingual Education Project. Toronto: OISE, 1977.

Bauer, R.A. (ed.), Social Indicators. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.

Becker, H. (ed.), Institutions and Persons, papers presented to Everett C. Hughes, Chicago, Adline, 1968.

Berman, P., and McLaughlin, M. Implementation of Educational Innovation. Educational Forum, March, 1976.

Blalock, H. Social Statistics, 2nd ed. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1972.

__________. Methodology in Social Research. Edited by Herbert and Ann Blalock. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1968.

Blau, P. and Ducan, O.D. with Andrew Truce. The American Occupational Structure. New York, Wiley, 1967.

Blishen, B.R. "A Socio-Economic Index for Occupations in Canada", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 4:40-53, 1967.

Bogden, R. and Taylor, S., Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods; a Phenomenological Approach to the Social Sciences, New York, John Wiley, 1975.

Bohrnstedt, G.W., "Observations on Measurements of Social Change", in E.F. Borgatta and G.W. Bohrnstedt (eds.), Sociological Methodology, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Bowles, S. and Gintis, H., Schooling in Capitalist America, New York, Basic Books, 1976.

Burns, G.E. Paper presented at the Durham Chapter, Canadian Parents for French, Oshawa, 1981.

__________. Paper presented at the Ontario Provincial Annual Conference of Canadian Parents for French, University of Guelph, 1981.

Burns, R.M. (ed.) One Country or Two, Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1979.

Cameron, D.M., Schools for Ontario: Policy-making, Administration and Finance in the 1960s. Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1972.

Carlton, R. L. Colley, and N. Mackinnon (eds.) Education, Change and Society: A Sociology of Canadian Education, Toronto: Gage Educational Publishing, 1977.

Carnoy, M. and Levin, M. (eds.) The Limits of Educational Reform. New York, D. Mackay, 1976.

Carnoy, M. Education as Cultural Imperialism. New York: David Mackay Co., 1974.

Charters, W. and Jones, J. On the Risk of Appraising Non-Events in Program Evaluation, Educational Research, Vol. 2, No. 11, 1973.

Cistone, P. (ed.) School Boards and the Political Fact. Toronto: OISE Press, 1972. Symposium Series No. 2.

Coleman, J. (ed.) Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Crawford, Patricia, An Evaluation of the French Immersion Program. Kindergarten-Grade Two. Willowdale: North York Board of Education, 1976.

Crysdale, S. "Aspiration and Expectations of High School Youth", in International Journal of Comparative Sociology, Vol. XVI, 1-2, 1975.

Curtis, J.E. and R.D. Lambert, "Educational Status and Reactions to Social and Political Heterogeneity", in Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, Vol. 1976.

Cziko, Gary A. and others. An Experiment in Trilingual Education, Report 4. Quebec: Shore Protestant Board.

Dew[illegible]in, N. The Research Act. Chicago, Aldine Publishing, 1970.

Edwards, H. Colletta, S., Fr. McCarey, H. and McLaughlin, M. Evaluation of the Federally and Provincially Funded Extensions of the Second Language Programs in the Schools of the Ottawa Roman Catholic School Board: Annual Report: Ottawa, Ministry of Education (Ontario), Contractual Research.

Edwards, H.P. and Smith, F. Evaluation of Second Language Programs and Some Alternatives for Teaching French as a Second Language in Grades Five to Eight. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

Elliott, J.L. (ed.) Two Nations, Many Cultures. Ethnic Groups in Canada. Toronto: Prentice Hall, 1979.

__________. Native Peoples. Minority Canadians I. Toronto: Prentice Hall, 1971

__________. Immigrant Groups. Minority Canadians 2. Toronto: Prentice Hall, 1971.

Elliott, J. and Adelman, C. 'Theory From Practice', A Final Report to the Ford Foundation, November, 1974.

Ellis, D. and Fleming W.G. Une Minorite s'explique. Les Attitudes de la population francophone du Nord-Est ontariens envers l'education de langue francaise. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. 1974.

Erickson, K.T. "A Comment on Disguised Observation in Sociology", Social Problems 14 (Spring): 366-73.

Fein, Leonard J. The Ecology of the Public Schools. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1971.

Filstead, W.J. Qualitative Methodology: First Hand Involvement with the Social World. Chicago, Markham Publishing, 1970.

Forcese, D. The Canadian Class Structure. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1975.

Fullan, M. and Park, P. La Mise En Oeuvre Des Programmes: Document d'appris. Toronto, Ministere de l'Education, 1981.

Fullan, M. and Pomfret, A. Research on Curriculum and Instruction Implementation. Review of Educational Research. Vol. 47, No. 2, Spring 1977, 335-397.

__________. Review on Research on Curriculum Implementation. Prepared for the U.S. National Institute of Education, April 1975.

Fullan, M. Implementation: Its Nature and Determinants. Decentralization Project No. 4 (Special Activity). International Management For Educational Change (IMTEC). Oslo, May, 1975.

Genesee, F. "A Longitudinal Evaluation of an Early Immersion School Program" in Canadian Journal of Education, No. 4 (1978), pp. 31-50.

Gibson, J. What About Core? Ottawa: Canadian Parents for French, 1979.

Goodlad, J.I. Dynamics of Educational Change. New York: McGraw Hill, 1975.

Goodlad and Klein, M.F. Behind the Classroom Door. Ohio: Jones Publishing Co., 1970.

Gross, N., Giacquinta, J., and Bernstein, M. Implementing Organizational Innovations. New York: Basic Books, 1971

__________. Failure to Implement a Major Organizational Innovation. In M. B. Miles and W.W. Charters (eds.) Learning in social settings: New readings on the social psychology of education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1970.

Gross, N. et al. Complex Organizations: The implementation of Major Organizational Innovation. A paper presented at the meeting of the American Sociological Association, Boston, August, 1968.

Harvey, E.B. Educational Systems and the Labour Market. Don Mills, Ont., Longman Canada Ltd., 1974.

Havelock, R.G. Planning for Innovation through Dissemination and Utilization of Knowledge. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1971.

Hay, W. M. The Elmgrove Experiment, Grade 7 Immersion. In Swain, M. (ed.) Bilingual Schooling, Toronto: OISE, Symposium Series I, 1972.

Hays, W.L. Statistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

HBERS: Hamilton Board of Education Research Services. Evaluation of the French Immersion Program in Earl Kitchener School, Hamilton. An interim report after year one of the program. Hamilton: Hamilton Board of Education.

House, E.H. The Politics of Educational Innovation. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1974.

Hughes, E. French Canada in Transition. The effects of Anglo-American industrialization upon a French Canadian small town. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1943.

Ireland, D.S. New Curricula: What is being asked of the Teacher? Orbit 36, Vol. 8, No. 1, Feb. 1977.

Jackson, R. (Commissioner). Final Report: Implications of Declining Enrolment for the Schools of Ontario: A Statement of Effects and Solutions. Toronto: Ministry of Education, Ontario.

Jencks, C. et al. Who Gets Ahead? Determinants of Economic Success in America. New York, Basic Books, 1979.

__________. Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effects of Family and Schooling in America. New York, Basic Books, 1972.

Kamerman, S.B. "Cross-National Perspective on Child Abuse and Neglect", Children Today, Vol. 4, No. 3, May-June, 1975.

Lapkin, S. "Bilingual Education in Ontario: Issues and Directions" in Interchange, Vol. 9, No. 4 (1978), pp. 11-19.

Lapkin, S., Andrew, C.M., Harley, B., Swain, M., and Kamin, J. The Immersion Centre and the Dual-Track School: A Study of the Relationship Between School Environment and Achievement in a French Immersion Program. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1979.

Laxer, G., Traub, Wayne. Student Social and Achievement Patterns. Toronto: OISE, H.S. 1 Studies, 1974.

Laxer, R.M. (ed.) Bilingual Tensions in Canada. Toronto: OISE Press, 1979, Curriculum Series 141.

Lazarsfeld, P.F., and Reitz, J.G. An Introduction to Applied Sociology, New York: Elsevier, 1975.

Leithwood, K.A., Holmes, M., and Montgomery, D.J. Helping Schools Change: Strategies Derived from Field Experience. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1979.

Levesque, R., and Chaiton, A. Education in a Changing Society: A View from Quebec. in Alf Chaiton and Neil McDonald (eds.) Canadian Schools and Canadian Identity, pp. 176-183. Toronto: Gage, 1977.

Levin, L. Comparative Studies in Foreign-Language Teaching. Stockholm, Almquist Wiksell, Goteberg Studies in Educational Sciences 9, 1972.

Light, R. (ed.) Language Proficiency, Language Testing and Bilingual Education. Special issue of the Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education (Spring 1981), Vol. V, No. 3.

Loftland, J. Analyzing Social Settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis. Belmont, Calif. Wadsworth, 1971.

Lortie, D. Unpublished data on the career demands of school administrators in Illinois. Data is currently available only by dirctly contacting Dr. Lortie at the Faculty of Education, University of Chicago.

Lukas, R. Minetown, Milltown, Railtown: Life in Canadian Communities of Single Industry. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.

MacLeans, Education Section. A guerrilla War Over Bilingual Learning: B.C. parents and officials are at odds as demand for French Immersion continues to soar. p. 56, August 31, 1981.

Mallay, J. and Shea,E. (compilers). Multiculturalism and Education: A select bibliography. Toronto: OISE Press, 1979. Informal Series No. 9.

Martell, G. (ed.) The Politics of the Canadian Public School. Toronto, Lewis and Samuel Publ., 1974.

Martin, J. "Goals in Education: Some Comparisons of Parents' Education and School Differences". Ottawa: Ottawa Board of Education Research Report, 72-10.

Mackinnon, F. The Politics of Education: A Study of the Political Administration of Public Schools. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1960.

McCall, G.J. and Simmons, J.L. Issues in participant observation: A text and reader. Reading, Mass., Addisson-Wesley, 1969.

McDiarmid, G. and D. Pratt. Teaching Prejudice. Toronto: OISE Press, 1971.

McInnis, C.E. and Donahue, E.E. Research and Evaluation of Second Language Programs, 1973-74, Ottawa. Ottawa: Carlton Roman Catholic Separate Board, English Schools under Ministry of Education contract.

McLaughlin, M. and Berman, P. Critical Processes in Implementation. Paper prepared for IMTEC/OECD Training Course, June 1975.

Mendenhall, W., Ott, L. and Schaeffer, R. Elementary Survey Sampling, Belmont, Calif. Wadsworth, 1971.

Ministry of Education, Contintuing Education: The Third System, Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education, 1980a.

Ministry of Education, French Core Programs: Curriculum Guideline for the Primary, Junior, Intermediate, and Senior Division. Toronto: Ministry of Education, 1980b.

Ministry of Education, Resource List for French as a Second Language: Core French Program, Primary, Junior, Intermediate and Senior Divisions. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education, 1979.

Ministry of Education, Teaching and Learning French as a Second Language, Toronto: Ministry of Education, 1977.

Ministry of Education. Report of the Ministerial Committee on the Teaching of French, Toronto: Ministry of Education, 1973.

Morrison, Frances E. Alternative School Programs for French Language Learning: Evaluation of the Federally and Provincially Funded Extensions of the Second Language Learning (French) Programs in the Schools of the Ottawa and Carlton Boards of Education, Third Annual Report. Ottawa: Ottawa Board of Education, Research Centre (under Ministry of Education, Ontario contract).

Office of the Assistant Deputy Minister of the Bureau de l'Education francaise. 'French Immersion', Education Manitoba, April, 1981.

Office of Economic Policy, Ontario. Statistical Profile of Northeastern Ontario. Toronto: Ministry of Treasury and Economics, 1979.

Olson, C.P. and Burns, G.E. Immersed for Change: Politics and Planning in French Immersion. Orbit, Toronto: OISE, December 1981 (forthcoming).

Ontario Economic Council, Development in Northern Ontario. Toronto: Government of Ontario Printer, 1976.

Ontario Ministry of Education. Memorandum to Directors of Education and Principals of Schools. Re: Exemption from Experimental Course Approval of French Second Language Extended and Immersion Programs. Toronto: 1977-78:44.

Oppenheim, A.N. *Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement*. New York, Basic Books, 1966.

Owens, R.G., and Steinhoff, C.R. *Administering Change in Schools*, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1976.

PCBE: Peel County Board of Education. *Processed Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on French Immersion*. Brampton: Peel County Board of Education.

Pineo, P.C. and Goyder, J.C. "Social Class Identification of National Sub-groups", in J. Curtis and W. Scott (eds.) *Social Stratification: Canada*, pp. 187-196. Toronto: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Pineo, P. and Porter, J. "Occupational Prestige in Canada", *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, Vol. 4, No. 1, Feb. 1967, pp. 24-40.

Phillips, *Social Research: Strategy and Tactics*, 3rd ed., New York, MacMillan, 1976.

Porter, John. *Canadian Social Structure*. A Statistical Profile. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1969.

__________. *The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.

Public Service Commission, *Annual Report*, Ottawa: The Public Service Commission, 1974.

Radwanski, G. *Trudeau*. Toronto: MacMillan, 1978.

Rioux, M. and Martin Yves. *French Canadian Society*, Vol. 1. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1964.

Rosenberg, M. *The Logic of Survey Analysis*. New York, Basic Books, 1968.

Royale Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. *The Cultural Contributions of Other Ethnic Groups*, Book IV. Ottawa: Queens Printer, 1970.

Royal Commission on Bilingualism. *Report of the Royale Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Book II*, Education. Ottawa: Queens Printers, 1968.

Royale Commission on Bilingualism. *Report of the Royale Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Book I. The Official Language.* Ottawa: Queens Printer, 1967.

Sarason, S.B. *The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies*. Washington: Jossey Bass Publishers, 1972.

__________. *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Schateman, L. and Strauss, L. *Field Research; Strategies for a Natural Sociology*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Selltiz, C., Wrightman, L.S., Stuart, W.C. *Research Methods in Social Relations*, 3rd. ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

Sewell, W. and Hauser, R. with D. Alwin and others. *Education, Occupation and Earning; Achievement in the Early Career*. New York: Academic Press, 1975.

Shapsow, S. and Kaufman, D. "A Study of a Late Immersion French Program in Secondary School", in *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 34 (2), pp. 186-93, 1978.

Sieber, S.D. Goals and Sagas - Organizational Influences on Innovative Roles (pp. 25-97) in Baldridge, J.V. et al (eds.) Managing Change in Educational Organizations: Sociological Perspectives, Strategies and Case Studies. Berkeley,Calif.: McCutchan Publ. Corp., 1975.

Sissows, C.B. *Bilingual Schools in Canada*, Toronto: Dent and Son, 1971.

Statistics Canada. "Income Distributions by Size in Canada - 1978", Statistics Canada Consumer and Expedition Division, Ottawa. Ministry of Supply and Services, Canada.

Stern, H.H. French Immersion in Canada: Achievements and Directions. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*. Vol. 34, No. 5, May 1978, pp. 836-854.

Stern, H.H. and Weinrib, A. "Foreign Languages for Younger Children: Trends and Assessments", in *Language Teaching and Linguistic Abstracts*, Vol. 10, No. 1, Jan. 1977.

Swain, M., and Barik, H.C. *Report to Ottawa Board of Education and Carleton Board of Education re: Evaluation of the 1976-77 French Immersion Program in Grades 4-6*. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1977. (mimeo.)

Swain, M., and Barik, H.C. Five Years of Primary French Immersion: Annual Reports of the Bilingual Education Prolect to the Carleton Board of Education and the Ottawa Board of Education up to 1975. Toronto: Ministry of Education, Ontario, 1976b.

Timmins Board of Education. *Final Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on French Immersion Programs in Secondary Schools*. Timmins: Timmins Board of Education.

The Task Force on Canadian Unity. *A Future Together: Observations and Recommendations*, Queens Printer, 1979.

Trites, R.L. and Price, M.A. *Learning Disabilities Found in Association with French Immersion Programming: A Gross Validation*. Toronto: Ministry of Education, Ontario (contractual research final report).

Troike, R. "Research Evidence for the Effectiveness of Bilingual Education", in *National Association for Bilingual Education Journal*, Vol. III, No. 1, Fall 1978.

Wade, M. *The French Canadians 1760-1967*. Vol. I, Toronto: Macmillan Co. Ltd., 1968.

__________. *The French Canadians 1760-1967*. Vol. II, Toronto: Macmillan Co. Ltd. 1968.

Warner, W. "Implementation as Belief", Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia, 1980.

Webb, E., Campbell, D., Schwartz, R.D., Sechrist, L. Unobtrusive Measures: Non-reactive Research in the Social Sciences. Chicago, Rand McNally, 1966.

Westie, F.R. "Towards Closer Relations Between Theory and Research: A Procedure and an Example", *American Sociological Review* 22 (April): 149-54.

APPENDIX A

FRANCOPHONE SCHOOLS IN THE SAMPLE

From our literature search and discussions with colleagues and ministry officials, we were led to believe that French Immersion was exclusively for Anglophone children and generally did not occur in Francophone schools. While these assertions are generally correct, they do not absolutely correspond to practice in the schools. Technically (*de jure*), all children in the eight boards we studied fit the description above--they are all Anglophones in Anglophone schools. In practice, the distinction was not so clear.

For instance, we found several variations which could be argued to be French Immersion programs which deviated from the two general rules. The most blatant example we found was in the French Roman Catholic separate school boards where French Immersion classes do, in fact, exist *but* (1) are not reported as such either to the boards or the ministry; (2) receive no transfer grants for French language learning by Anglophones since this learning is not reported; and (3) where teachers and principals both publicly deny that what we are suggesting may be French Immersion classes are, in fact, French Immersion. It may seem curious that administrators would actively deny the existence of programs which are in their schools, especially if one speculates that they might receive extra funds if they did acknowledge the presence of such programs. We believe that French Immersion classes, however, do exist in the Francophone separate schools we observed, but that the reasons why school officials publicly deny their existence have to do with local community and school board politics. Notably, many Francophone ratepayers and their trustees oppose the use of their schools by Anglophones. Principals often reported that these ratepayers and trustees express fears that the presence of substantial numbers of Anglophones in their schools will accelerate the acculturation process from "French" to "English"--a process which many fear will take place (if it hasn't already happened) in a province like Ontario which is predominantly Anglophone. If school administrators publicly admitted that their schools catered to Anglophone children they might cause a serious political backlash. Understandably, administrators and teachers in these schools are shy to advertise the Anglophone presence, let alone to acknowledge that these Anglophones are not only encouraged, but also receive what amounts to a different (and, thus, special) curriculum. The most dramatic example which we encountered of the tendency of Francophone school officials to guard information about Anglophone immersion-type programs in their schools occurred in one board where the ranks of Francophone ratepayers aware of the Anglophone immersion-type classes in their schools included the majority of the members of the board itself. Given this furtive attitude on the part of school administrators and teachers towards these programs, it is not surprising that the ministry and others appear to be similarily uninformed about these programs.

Two logical questions may be in the reader's mind: (1) how do we, as researchers, know that these programs are actually French Immersion courses? And (2) if we are right that these programs do constitute French Immersion and also that they create serious internal political problems for these schools, why would these school officials bother to have such troublesome programs at all?

The answer to the first question regarding the data sources that lead us to argue that these classes can be described as functionally French Immersion classes comes from our interviews with teachers and principals in these schools. All the respondents interviewed in these schools began by strongly denying that they were French Immersion teachers. At this point, we would ask the respondents if it were true that all (or almost all) of the children in their particular class were from Anglophone homes. Uniformly, they replied "yes". Next, we asked the respondents if this varied from most other classes in their school where all the children would be from Francophone homes; again, the answer was affirmative in all cases. Then we proceeded by asking respondents whether (1) they taught in both languages, and (2) they used special curricula and teaching aids to take account of the fact that their pupils come from Anglophone homes. The typical response went something like, "Well, yes, of course... . It is difficult to systematically document perceptual reaction without the use of archival devises (such as video tape), but the interviewers noticed strong reactions from the respondents. Two respondents who had initially refused to answer our questionnaire on the grounds that they were "not French Immersion teachers" later agreed to answer on the understanding that we would not report that they had claimed to be French Immersion teachers. (These interviews are reported in our table of interviews completed but are not coded in our statistical data). We submit, however, that their responses indicate that their teaching practice is functionally that of a French Immersion program. Data gathering in private discussion suggests that teachers are also aware of this.

As for the second question (Why do these schools bother to have French Immersion (or immersion-like classes) if they are so much trouble?), the answers given to us privately by both teachers and principals is that the immersion-type programs attract sufficient numbers of students to keep their school open when, otherwise, it would have to be closed because of declining enrolment. Again, privately, principals will tell you that they welcome extra students but that they are forced to downplay the existence of these programs (1) because of the political and cultural fears of Francophone ratepayers as outlined above; and (2) because of the fear that the open acknowledgement of these programs would create interschool tensions with those regular English-stream separate schools which the "immersion" students would normally have attended. Francophone administrators understandably fear that English language separate schools would resent the depletion of their potential school population, especially in small communities where numbers are small to begin with and relationships within boards can often be intensely personal.

To make their plight even worse, the same demographic pressures that force the principals to downplay the presence of immersion-type courses in their schools, cause them simultaneously to have to recruit students for these programs by assuring the parents that immersion techniques *are* practically used in their schools. If principals (and teachers) do not give such assurances (at least to Anglophone parents), they risk losing the students they so urgently need to keep their school in operation. In some cases, the number of these "immersion" students means the difference between having or not having a job.

As an additional note, the students in the classes we are discussing are also generally welcomed by school personnel because their performance as a group is excellent and they tend to be model students. Their teachers overwhelmingly expressed what a particular joy it was to teach them. For instance, regardless of their initial arguments that they were not French Immersion teachers, virtually all these teachers voluntarily reported that because of their teaching experiences they had become strong believers in the pedagogical ability of French Immersion to make students bilingual, despite their initial skepticism. As we shall discuss later, principals in these schools did not generally worry about the ability of the Anglophones in these classes to adjust to French learning, but did worry (1) that Francophones would resent their presence if it were made widely known (as noted above), or (2) that Francophones would discover that it was not the case that they were being acculturated by the Anglophone presence but that the bilingual Anglophones generally outperformed the Francophones, including in French.

A second group of students who, as a result of our research, we would describe as being in immersion-type programs, but who would not be achknowledged as such in the French Immersion literature or in ministry counts, were Franco-Ontarians. These students can be divided into two groups.

In the first group are those Francophone students whose parents placed them in immersion classes because they believed the French Immersion program to be academically superior. As we shall argue later, the French Immersion classes are, indeed, of generally higher quality, which suggests that this parental perception is founded in actual program performance.

In the second group are Francophone students, enrolled usually in separate schools, who have French surnames but one or both of whose parents have been effectively acculturated by Anglo-Ontarian language and culture. Principals in these Francophone schools reported to us that many of this type of parent expressed "guilt" or were "touchy" about their cultural identity. To insure the process of "Francization of their children, these parents enrol them in Francophone schools. This contrasts with their own backgrounds, as many had gone to English language schools.

One practical problem with this arrangement is that children who do not speak French themselves (and whose parents do not speak French) have difficulty keeping up when dispersed among either unilingual French-speaking or fully bilingual students who have the further advantage of hearing French spoken at home. Thus, the attempt to recover an ethnic, linguistic, and religious identity poses practical pedagogical problems for the school officials who must make this dream tangible in the school environment. In response to this dilemma, various principals have established separate classes for these children which are remarkably similar to immersion classes. The goal of these classes is to use bilingual learning and curriculum modifications to aid the children in adjusting to the French language curriculum. There are variations on this theme; for instance, some schools only offer such classes at the junior-kindergarten level while in others, the program extends into high school. But in all cases, the aim is to integrate the children into regular French-stream classes and to instill in them the Franco-Ontarian culture. This latter goal, held by the school personnel and the parents, contrasts with the goals of many (perhaps most) Anglophone parents of children in French Immersion: while the acculturated Franco-Ontarian is forced into a bilingual situation to recover a lost cultural identity, most Anglophone parents we interviewed wantedtheir children to be fully bilingual but to remain Anglophone in their ethnic identity. The Anglophones, therefore, wanted full bilingualism but not necessarily biculturalism.

In the Franco-Ontarian situation, politics and cultural concerns were again an issue. Principals and teachers were very reluctant to publicly acknowledge that their schools contained anything but regular French-stream classes. This position was maintained in one school even when those classes we would call "immersion" classes were, by the principal's own admission, deliberately located in portable classrooms outside the school so that the regular French students (and their parents) would not hear the English being spoken (particularily by their teachers). Privately, the teachers and administrators express the view that bilingual learning is the only way that acculturated Francophones may ever seriously hope to be re-integrated with the other students in the school on an equal basis. Thus, again, the only politically acceptable stance which the principals may take in their dealings with parents and boards - i.e., that their schools teach only French - is at variance with both the actual practice and their own pedagogical beliefs that bilingual learning can be a useful and even necessary tool.

We do not wish to overstate our case. These examples are still exceptions to the general rules which were initially suggested and which still hold: that French Immersion serves Anglophones and does so in Anglophone schools. Nonetheless, we feel that reporting these examples is important for several reasons. First, none of these cases (to our knowledge) is explored in the literature. Noting them, therefore, increases our knowledge of the range of actual practices. Second, as demographic pressures continue to bring about decling enrolment, the issue of immersion in now-traditional settings (especially Francophone schools) is likely to heat up. Third, as we try to argue later on in this report, there are often major gaps between the conceptual designs of pedagogical plans and their practical implementations. These examples illustrate nicely, we believe, how complex these issues of cultural and language learning can become in actual settings. We think this contains an important message for the viability of these programs. A program like French Immersion may work perfectly well as a teaching technique; but, if its implementation causes one school (such as a regular English separate school) to lose students to the benefit of another school (such as a Francophone separate school), or if, to give another example, the influx of Anglophone students into a Francophone school causes fear among Francophones that their own children's cultural identity may be lost, then the anger and hostility, and the political pressure generated may result in the closing of one or another program, further adding to the diviseness of the situation. We believe all programs would be better served by informed knowledge of these social and political perceptions and forces, as well as by consideration of the pedagogical effects of programs.

APPENDIX B

LETTERS OF ENTRY AND RESPONSE FORMS

APPENDIX B1

Dr. George E. Burns
Northeastern Centre -- Timmins
P.O. Box 1020
Timmins, Ontario P4N 7H7

C. Paul Olson
Department of Sociology
Central Ontario Centre
252 Bloor St. W.
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1V6

Dear

Re: Request for permission to conduct interviews and questionnaires to persons involved with French Immersion Programme.

We are researchers at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education who are currently conducting funded research in order to assess the effects of various methods, procedures, and strategies for innovating French Immersion programmes in Northern Ontario communities. Our objective is to develop suggestions to boards as to optimal strategies for continuing and innovating French Immersion programmes.

Both the principle researchers are familiar with Northern Ontario communities, schools and French Immersion programmes. Dr. George E. Burns is a member of faculty (Office of Field Development, O.I.S.E.) and is cross appointed to the Department of Sociology. He is project director at the Northeastern Field Development Centre in Timmins. Professor Olson is a member of faculty in the Department of Sociology at O.I.S.E. He has lectured widely in the North and as a result has ongoing relationships with Northern educators including teaching, researching and field development.

French Immersion programmes, as you are aware, have been a part of the offerings of a number of Northern boards, including your own, for several years now. Isolated reviews of these programmes have occurred at the level of individual boards; in addition, there have been several more general reviews focussing on curriculum issues in French Immersion. To date, however, there has been little systematic work evaluating the sociological impact of the French Immersion programmes in terms of either a) the effectiveness of the programmes as change agents of curriculum innovation or b) in terms of what effects various methods of innovation of programmes have upon the perceptions of programmes to the respective Anglophone and Francophone communities as well as the parents directly involved in these courses.

We propose to review the history and manner in which programmes have evolved in a number of boards, hopefully, including your own. Concretely, we propose to interview administrators and teachers involved in the French Immersion projects and where relevant, feasible, and agreeable to boards to request data on programmes in statistical form (e.g. how often teachers in programmes are transferred, replaced, etc.). In addition we propose to send questionnaires to members of both language communities based upon randon selection and to administer questionnaires to parents in the Immersion programme with the goal to determine the parents' perception of the programme.

All data to be gathered is to be confidential at both the individual and board level. Our goal is not to either praise of condemn particular persons, boards or practices, but to provide interested boards, including your own with a) some idea of the range of strategies for programme innovation: b) suggestions for techniques of policies which seem particularly useful in the development and continuation of these programmes; and c) we would hope to offer a road map to some of the caveats we have observed in the history of various boards' attempts to pilot these programmes. The utility to Boards in having such information is that our work furnishes boards with comparative data and policy recommendations in developing and implementing immersion programmes.

The researchers recognize that interviewing and questionnaires pose some imposition of persons involved. We assure you the time and inconvenience in conducting interviews and questionnaires will be kept to a minimum. Participation will, of course, be both volumtary and subject to board approval. Interview schedules and questionnaires will be provided to the board. As previously mentioned, both anonymity of both Boards and individuals will be respected. All participating boards will receive copies of the final report which will contain concrete data, suggestions and options to enhance French Immersion programmes.

We look forward to the opportunity to cooperate with you in our joint participation in this project. Mr. Burns will be contacting you within the next two weeks concerning your participation, any futher questions which you might have, and information concerning the logistics of scheduling interviews and questionnaires and other technical matters.

Your cooperation is very much appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

C. Paul Olson

George E. Burns

APPENDIX B2

THE ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION
Department of Sociology in Education

Memorandum

TO: School Principals

FROM: George E. Burns & C. Paul Olson
Department of Sociology

DATE: June 16, 1980

RE: The French Immersion Project

This particular phase of the French Immersion Project involves surveying all Immersion Parents and French Immersion Students in grades 6, 7 & 8. To this end, we have pre-packaged the Parent Questionnaire by class These questionnaires have a yellow cover page and are enclosed in an envelope. Questionnaires for French Immersion students in grades 6, 7 & 8 have an orange cover page.

Procedure: French Immersion Student Questionnaire

Please ask your French Immersion teachers of Immersion students in grades 6, 7 & 8 to have their French Immersion students complete the "Student Questionnaire" today, in the classroom. Pre-test data suggest that the questionnaire can be completed in less than half an hour. Once the students have completed the questionnaire, the questionnaires should be collected by the teacher, placed in the accompanying "interdepartmental mail envelope" which should be forwarded to your office. We will "pick-up" these envelopes at your school towards the beginning of next week.

French Immersion Parent Questionnaire

Each envelope contains one questionnaire. The questionnaires have been pre-packaged by class. Please ask your French Immersion Teachers to ask each child to take an envelope (including the questionnaire) home and ask his/her parent to complete the questionnaire tonight or tomorrow and to return the completed questionnaire (enclosed in the sealed envelope to school with his/her child) no later than Thursday. The returned envelopes should be forwarded to your office by the classroom teacher. We will "pick-up" the envelopes at your school towards the beginning of next week.

Paul and I understand that this aspect of the study may appear to be late during the academic year. On the other hand, we are convinced that the "timing" is excellent insofar as obtaining "rich data" is concerned.

Yours respectfully,

George E. Burns

Department of Sociology

C. Paul Olson
C. Paul Olson

APPENDIX B3

THE ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION

Department of Sociology in Education

MEMORANDUM

TO: French Immersion Teachers

FROM: George E. Burns & C. Paul Olson
Department of Sociology

DATE: June 16, 1980

RE: The French Immersion Project

This particular phase of the French Immersion Project involves surveying all Immersion Parents and French Immersion Students in grades 6, 7 & 8. To this end, we have pre-packaged the Parent Questionnaire by class. These questionnaires have a yellow cover page and are enclosed in an envelope. Questionnaires for French Immersion students in grades 6, 7 & 8 have an orange cover page.

Procedure: French Immersion Students in Grades 6, 7 & 8

If you are a French Immersion teacher of Immersion students in grades 6, 7 & 8, please administer the "student questionnaire as follows:

(1) Give each pupil a student questionnaire to be completed in class. Pre-test data suggest that the questionnaire can be completed in less than half an hour. You may want to help the pupils along by reading each question and clarifying as required.

(2) Please collect the completed questionnaires, place them in the accompanying "interdepartmental envelope" and seal the envelope.

(3) Forward (perhaps by way of a student) the sealed envelope to your school principal. We will pick-up the sealed envelope at your school towards the beginning of next week.

Procedure: French Immersion Parent Questionnaire

NOTE: For the Attention of All Immersion Teachers· Parent Questionnaire is for parents of Immersion children Pre-K to grade 8 inclusive.

Each envelope contains one questionnaire. The questionnaires have been pre-packaged by class (Pre-K to grade 8). Please ask each child in your immersion class to take an envelope (including the questionnaire) home and ask his/her parent to complete the questionnaire tonight or tomorrow and to return the completed questionnaire (enclosed in the sealed envelope to school with his/her child) no

.....2

later than Thursday. The returned envelopes should be forwarded to *your* principal's office by you, the classroom teacher. We will "pick-up" the envelopes at your school towards the beginning of next week.

Paul and I understand that this aspect of the study may appear to be late during the academic year. On the other hand, we are convinced that the "timing" is excellent insofar as obtaining "rich data" is concerned.

Yours respectfully,

George E. Burns

George E. Burns

Department of Sociology

C. Paul Olson

C. Paul Olson

APPENDIX B4

RESPONSE RATE DATA FORM

(To be completed only by the classroom teachers)

1. What is the grade level of this Immersion class? ________
2. How may pupils are in this class? ___________
3. If this is a grade 6, 7 or 8 class, how many students have completed the student questionnaire? ______________
4. How many Immersion Parents (from your class) have completed and returned the "Parent Questionnaire?_________________

To the teacher:

These data are vitally important. Without them, we are unable to establish the degree of generalizability of our findings. With this in mind; would you be so very kind as to complete this form and return it along with the completed questionnaires to your principal.

George & Paul

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRES/INTERVIEW SCHEDULES FOR PARENTS, STUDENTS, TEACHERS*, AND POST IMMERSION QUESTIONNAIRES

*Principal questionnaires are not included here since they largely duplicate the teachers questionnaire. Copies of the principal questionnaire are available from either investigator upon request.

APPENDIX C1

THE ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION

THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY IN EDUCATION

FRENCH IMMERSION STUDY:

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Your School Board along with numerous others in Northeastern Ontario is taking part in a study conducted by the Ontario Institute For Studies In Education (the Department of Sociology in Education) to examine the effects of various methods, procedures and strategies for developing and implementing French Immersion programs. The main purpose of this research project is to provide boards with comparative data and policy recommendations in connection with the ongoing development and implementation of Bilingual Education programs.

Three phases of our study have already been completed. Over the past two months we have (a) interviewed all French Immersion principals within your board (b) interviewed all French Immersion teachers within your board, and (c) surveyed French Immersion students in grades 6, 7 and 8.

We have now reached the "parent phase" of the project. The researchers recognize that questionnaires pose some impositions of persons involved. However, we think you will find the questionnaire interesting to answer. Since all participating boards will receive copies of our final report, which will contain concrete data and policy recommendations for enhancing French Immersion programs, your input is vitally important.

All information collected in this study is confidential. In order to ensure confidentiality, please do not sign your name on any part of the questionnaire. Once you have completed the questionnaire, place it in the accompanying envelope, seal the envelope and have your Immersion Child return it to his/her classroom teacher. We have arranged to "pick-up" the sealed envelopes at your child's school. The envelopes will remain sealed until opened by our research team at the Ontario Institute For Studies In Education in Toronto.

Sincerely,

George E. Burns

Dr. George E. Burns

C. Paul Olson

Professor C. Paul Olson

SECTION A

Attitudes and Opinion Section

The following section deals with reasons that influenced your decision to enter your child in immersion and also some questions of personal beliefs. To make sound policy regarding immersion it is important to know how parents feel. In this section we ask you to specify your personal beliefs.

Reasons for enrolment

1. How important would you estimate that each of the following was in your decision to enrol your child in French Immersion? (Please circle the number for each statement that best describes your belief)

	Very Important Consideration	Important Consideration	Minor Consideration	No Influence
(a) It would give my child a better access to jobs.	1	2	3	4
(b) It is important to learn another language.	1	2	3	4
(c) My belief that mastery of second language is an important part of education.	1	2	3	4
(d) Immersion is a form of enrichment.	1	2	3	4
(e) French Immersion helps children to regain Francophone identity.	1	2	3	4
(f) Canada's future depends upon bilingual citizens.	1	2	3	4
(g) Children's friends were in the program.	1	2	3	4
(h) My friends had enroled their child in the Immersion program.	1	2	3	4
(i) Teacher, principal, superintendent, trustee or consultant convinced us of the programs merit.	1	2	3	4
(j) Recommendation of a relative in another community who was involved with Immersion program.	1	2	3	4
(k) Other (specify) __________	1	2	3	4

Personal Beliefs

2. Please circle the alternative which best describes your own opinion or belief.
Note: If you circle ① that means you strongly agree with the statement. If you circle ⑤ that means you strongly disagree, etc.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a. French Immersion is the best way for English-speaking children to become truly bilingual.	1	2	3	4	5
b. French Immersion makes school more interesting for children.	1	2	3	4	5
c. The presence of French Immersion in Ontario schools shows Quebec that we are concerned about Canadian Unity.	1	2	3	4	5
d. A bilingual person is a better educated person.	1	2	3	4	5
e. Cost of expanding French Immersion to the secondary level is well justified compared to other program needs.	1	2	3	4	5
f. French Immersion programs are not a good idea because they make children in them different from their friends.	1	2	3	4	5
g. French Immersion programs are not a good idea because they create an elite group.	1	2	3	4	5
h. The money spent on French Immersion would be better spent on improving instruction in French available to students in all English schools.	1	2	3	4	5
i. The money spent on French Immersion would be better spent on improving instruction in French available to students in French language schools.	1	2	3	4	5
j. The money spent on French Immersion would be better spent on improving instruction in all subjects throughout the school system.	1	2	3	4	5
k. Many children come out of French Immersion programs deficient in English language skills.	1	2	3	4	5

2. (continued)

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
l.	French Immersion courses should be different in content from regular courses.	1	2	3	4	5
m.	French language radio and television is very important in aiding French Immersion students master French.	1	2	3	4	5
n.	My attitude towards French Immersion has changed for the better over the last few years.	1	2	3	4	5
o.	French Immersion aids in bringing the French and the English together.	1	2	3	4	5
p.	There will be problems extending French Immersion to the high school.	1	2	3	4	5
q.	In general, the French community supports immersion.	1	2	3	4	5
r.	Non-immersion teachers worry that Immersion programs limit their funds and may cost their jobs.	1	2	3	4	5
s.	In general, the English community supports Immersion.	1	2	3	4	5
t.	Schools should provide immersion children with opportunities to travel to locations in Quebec where the majority of the people speak French.	1	2	3	4	5
u.	Children in French Immersion who are more fluent in French (because of their backgrounds) than others, have an unfair advantage in entering French Immersion programs.	1	2	3	4	5
v.	The French Immersion program in our area should put more emphasis on grammar and reading skills.	1	2	3	4	5
w.	The French Immersion program in our area should put more emphasis on speaking and listening skills.	1	2	3	4	5
x.	The teachers in our French Immersion program are capable in French.	1	2	3	4	5
y.	Teachers in our French Immersion program are academically well qualified.	1	2	3	4	5
z.	French Immersion should be extended to the secondary level.	1	2	3	4	5
z.	The cost of expanding French Immersion to the secondary level is justified compared to other program needs.	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION B

In this section we ask you about your experiences, preferances and perceptions as a result of having a child/children enrolled in a French Immersion program. Please circle the code which corresponds to your observations.

SA - Strongly Agree
A - Agree
UN - Undecided
D - Disagree
SD - Strongly Disagree

1. (1) Children who enter into French Immersion programs have sufficient knowledge of French to handle homework in the early grades (e.g. the first three years). SA A UN D SD

(2) I believe it is easier for French Immersion students to do homework if their parents are fluent in French. SA A UN D SD

(3) Homework becomes more difficult for French Immersion students whose parents are not fluent in French as the student progresses (by grade) in the program. SA A UN D SD

(4) I had considerable involvement with other parents with children in French Immersion prior to enrolling my child in Immersion. SA A UN D SD

(5) The subject material given to French Immersion students is different in content from other programs. SA A UN D SD

(6) Subjects such as history/geography (social studies) are given different emphasis or different content when taught in a French Immersion program. SA A UN D SD

(7) I find it difficult to assist my immersion child with homework because I have inadequate ability in French. SA A UN D SD

(8) Non Immersion parents of Anglophone students are positive towards the French Immersion program. SA A UN D SD

(9) Francophones within the community are supportive of French Immersion programs. SA A UN D SD

(10) Parents of students presently in the French Immersion program want additional opportunities for learning French extended to the secondary school level. SA A UN D SD

(11) Our Board of Education is planning to extend opportunities for learning french into the secondary level (courses beyond the regular french courses available in English language secondary schools) for students presently in the French Immersion program. SA A UN D SD

(12) After grade eight, I would like my immersion child to proceed to an English language Secondary School where several subjects (at each grade level) will be available in the French language. SA A UN D SD

(13) After grade eight, I would like my immersion child to proceed to a French language Secondary School where only English as a subject is taught in English. SA A UN D SD

(14) After grade eight, I would like my immersion child to proceed to a bilingual Secondary School where all subjects are available in English and French and where he/she can elect to pursue any or all courses in the language of his/her choice. SA A UN D SD

(15) I suspect that there will not be any problems in extending additional opportunities for learning French to French Immersion students at the secondary school level. SA A UN D SD

(16) When my immersion child moves on to the secondary school level I would like him/her to have whatever opportunities are required to increase his/her French language fluency. SA A UN D SD

(17) French Immersion programs are becoming increasingly popular among ratepayers. SA A UN D SD

(18) Implementing the French Immersion program has progressed smoothly in our community. SA A UN D SD

(19) The French Immersion program is fulfilling the educational expectations that I have for my child. SA A UN D SD

(20) I often doubt the merits of keeping my child in the French Immersion program. SA A UN D SD

(21) I find it easy to discuss my immersion child's progress with school personnel. SA A UN D SD

(22) French Immersion students achieve well in English. SA A UN D SD

(23) Parents of French Immersion students are influential in bringing about changes in the French Immersion program in our school. SA A UN D SD

(24) There are too many students in French Immersion classes. SA A UN D SD

(25) Our school principal is a strong supporter of the French Immersion program. SA A UN D SD

(26) Our Board of Education supports the French Immersion program strongly. SA A UN D SD

(27) My child finds homework a frustrating experience because of inadequate ability in French to cope with homework assignments. SA A UN D SD

(28) Formal evaluation of the French Immersion program (to show if the program is working well or not) is needed. SA A UN D SD

(29) It is better to have French Immersion programs in dual track schools (French Immersion and Non-French Immersion "Anglophone" students in the same building). SA A UN D SD

(30) It is better to have French Immersion programs in dual track schools (French Immersion and Non-French Immersion "Francophone" students in the same building). SA A UN D SD

(31) It is better to have French Immersion classes housed in a French Immersion Centre (a school in which there are only French Immersion students). SA A UN D SD

(32) Those who wish to learn French should attend a French language school. SA A UN D SD

2. There is some question as to how much contact French Immersion and Non-Immersion students should have in school settings. (Choose the single best answer). It is better to:

(a) Have a French Immersion program with a separate principal in a separate building from other programs.

(b) Have a French Immersion program in a separate part of an Anglophone (English speaking) school as a separate program with a common principal.

(c) Have a French Immersion program in a Francophone school with a Francophone principal.

(d) Have a French Immersion program which is run such that French Immersion is taken as a class part of the day and Immersion children take other classes with non-immersion students the rest of the day but all under the same principal.

(e) Other (specify) ______________________________

____

____

3. What is the name of your immersion child's school? ______________

____

SECTION C

Now we would like to ask you a few "open-ended" questions about French Immersion. For each item please give written information in the space provided. If there is insufficient space, you may wish to write on the back of the page.

1. If French Immersion is expanded to the secondary level, (Anglophone School) what courses do you believe it would be necessary to offer in French?

____

____

____

2. What could your board do to improve French Immersion programs?

____

____

____

3. What could your principal do to improve French Immersion?

____

____

____

4. What could teachers do to help French Immersion be better?

____

____

____

5. Do you have any other suggestions about French Immersion?

____

____

____

6. What would you say has been the greatest failing of French Immersion in your school?

____

____

____

7. What would you say has been its greatest success? ______________

____

____

____

SECTION D

Background and Demographic Data

The purpose of this section is to obtain background data on you and your spouse. This information while important is just for statistical purposes. Our reasons for asking this information is that our study of French Immersion deals with social aspects and implications of French Immersion programs. Please answer each question as accurately as you can.

THANK YOU

1. What is the maternal tongue of yourself and your spouse?

	Self	Spouse
1. French	☐	☐
2. English	☐	☐
3. Other	☐	☐

2. Please rate your own skills (and the skills of your spouse) on the following scales by circling the alternative that best describes your situations.

	Not at All 1	Slightly 2	Somewhat 3	Quite Well 4	Fluently 5
(a) Read French					
Yourself	1	2	3	4	5
Spouse	1	2	3	4	5
(b) Write French					
Yourself	1	2	3	4	5
Spouse	1	2	3	4	5
(c) Speak French					
Yourself	1	2	3	4	5
Spouse	1	2	3	4	5
(d) Understand French					
Yourself	1	2	3	4	5
Spouse	1	2	3	4	5

3. What is the sex of the person(s) responding to this questionnaire?

☐ Male
☐ Female
☐ Jointly completed

4. What is your occupation? (Please be specific: mechanic; bus driver; college instructor; small business owner; homemaker, etc.)

____

5. What is the occupation of your spouse? (Be specific)

____

6. Circle the catagory that describes your family's combined income from all sources.

1. 0 - 4,999
2. 5,000 - 9,999
3. 10,000 - 14,999
4. 15,000 - 19,999
5. 20,000 - 24,999
6. 25,000 - 29,999
7. 30,000 - 34,999
8. 35,000 - 39,999
9. 40,000 - 44,999
10. 45,000 - 49,999
11. 50,000 - 54,999
12. 55,000 or more

7. Religious Preference:

	Self	Spouse
1. Protestant	☐	☐
2. Roman Catholic	☐	☐
3. Other (specify)	☐	☐
4. None	☐	☐

8. Are you:

☐ Public school supporter
☐ Separate school supporter

9. If a Separate school supporter, are your immersion children housed in:

☐ A French language school in which there is French Immersion.
☐ An English language school in which there is French Immersion.
☐ A French Immersion school in which there are only French Immersion students.

10. Which of these was the last school that you and your spouse attended? Please place a check ✓ mark in the box that best describes your situations.

	You yourself		Spouse	
	Some	Graduated	Some	Graduated
No formal schooling				
Public/Grade School				
Secondary School				
University (Please indicate highest degree)				
Community College				
CEGEP				
Other (please specify)				

11. Give the year you were born: 19____

12. Give the year your spouse was born: 19____

13. Marital status: ☐ Single ☐ Married ☐ Widowed(er) ☐ Divorced ☐ Separated ☐ Other ________

14. Number of people in your household: ________

15. Please list all your children in school by giving their grade and sex:

Child's Grade	Sex	Class Size	Child's Grade	Sex	Class Size
(1) ______	M F	______	(4) ______	M F	______
(2) ______	M F	______	(5) ______	M F	______
(3) ______	M F	______	(6) ______	M F	______

(If necessary please use back)

16. If the child(ren) is (or was) in immersion, please give the child's current grade; class size; sex and the grade entered immersion. Also give the highest grade the child has gone to or will go to in Immersion.

Current Grade	Class Size	Sex	Grade Entered	Highest Grade	Current Grade	Class Size	Sex	Grade Entered	Highest Grade
(1)____	____	M F	____	____	(4)____	____	M F	____	____
(2)____	____	M F	____	____	(5)____	____	M F	____	____
(3)____	____	M F	____	____	(6)____	____	M F	____	____

(If necessary please use back)

17. Please feel free to make any additional comments on French Immersion or this questionnaire.

Please place this completed questionnaire in the accompanying envelope; seal the envelope and ask your immersion child to return it to his/her classroom teacher. Our research team has made arrangements to pick-up the sealed envelopes at the school later this week.

Thank you for your time and co-operation.

George E. Burns
Dr. George E. Burns

C. Paul Olson
Professor C. Paul Olson

APPENDIX C2

THE ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION

THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY IN EDUCATION

FRENCH IMMERSION STUDY: STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

This is a survey of French Immersion students in grades 6, 7 and 8. It is about your opinions regarding different aspects of bilingual education.

This survey is part of a large study involving principals, teachers, students and parents from several different boards of education in Northeastern Ontario. You will be asked to have your parents complete a questionnaire tonight. We would like you to return your parent's completed questionnaire to school, tomorrow. The results of the study will help us understand more about the way people relate to French Immersion programs.

There are no right or wrong answers. People have different views about French Immersion. We would like to know your own feelings

Please do not write your name on the questionnaire. It is anonymous, so that no one will know your individual answers.

The questions should be answered by drawing a circle around the number beside the statement which shows how you feel about the question.

Example: Are you presently in a French Immersion Program?

Yes ....①

No 2

If you are presently in a French Immersion program, you would circle the number ① as in the example.

Thank you very much.

George E. Burns

Dr. George E. Burns

C. Paul Olson

Professor C. Paul Olson

Department of Sociology,
The Ontario Institute for
Studies in Education.

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

(Please circle one number for each question).

1. How old are you?

10 years or younger 1
11 years....................2
12 years....................3
13 years....................4
14 years....................5
15 years or older 6

2. Are you male or female?

Male 1
Female 2

3. What is your present grade level (the grade you are in this year)?

Grade 6 1
Grade 7 2
Grade 8 3

4. How many years have you been in a French Immersion program (including this year)?

This is my first year 1
Second year 2
Third year 3
Fourth year 4
Fifth year 5
Sixth year 6
Seventh year 7
Eighth year 8
Ninth year or more 9

5. Do you presently attend a Roman Catholic Separate School or a Public School.

Roman Catholic Separate School ... 1
Public School 2

6. Which of the following best describes the type of school you presently attend.

An English language school in which there is French Immersion.................................. 1
A French language school in which there is French Immersion.................................. 2
A French Immersion school in which there are only French Immersion students.................... 3

SECTION II: GENERAL QUESTIONS

(Please answer each question by circling the number which comes closest to your answer, unless otherwise indicated).

7. What are your future plans in school at this time? (Choose one).

   Go to work before I finish high school 1

   Finish high school and then go to work 2

   Finish high school and then do an apprenticeship program.3

   Finish high school then go to a community college 4

   Finish high school then go to a university 5

   Complete university and continue with graduate or professional training 6

   Don't know 7

8. What occupation would you like to hold when you are an adult? (Please be specific: mechanic; bus driver; college instructor; small business owner; homemaker, etc.) ____________________

9. Tell us which of the following educational goals (in elementary school) is most important to you.

   Knowledge of academic subjects 1

   To become bilingual (fluent in English and French) 2

   My own individual development and self direction 3

10. Which of these goals do you think your parents would say is most important?

    Knowledge of academic subjects 1

    To become bilingual (fluent in English and French) 2

    My own individual development and self direction 3

11. Which of these goals do you think your teacher would say is most important?

    Knowledge of academic subjects 1

    To become bilingual (fluent in English and French) 2

    My own personal development and self direction 3

12. What is the name of your school? ____________________

(Circle one number for each question)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
13. I look forward to French Immersion classes.	1	2	3	4	5
14. French Immersion classes are very important and valuable to me.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Most of the French Immersion classes are boring	1	2	3	4	5
16. I am in a French Immersion program because it will give me better access to jobs some day.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I think every student should learn French	1	2	3	4	5
18. French Immersion is a form of enrichment in school	1	2	3	4	5
19. Canada's future depends upon bilingual citizens	1	2	3	4	5
20. Most of my friends are in French Immersion.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Students who are in the French Immersion program have to work harder than students who are not in French Immersion.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I am proud of the fact that I can speak French.	1	2	3	4	5
23. A bilingual person is a better educated person.	1	2	3	4	5
24. When I am in high school I would like to take several courses in the French language each year.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
25. If I was not in a French Immersion program my parents would be able to help me more with my homework.	1	2	3	4	5
26. If I ever have children I would want them to be in a French Immersion program.	1	2	3	4	5
27. If I were not in a French Immersion program my marks would be higher.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I find homework a frustrating experience because I have inadequate ability in French to do homework assignments.	1	2	3	4	5
29. If I had to attend a French language secondary school, I could be successful.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I like people to know that I am a French Immersion student.	1	2	3	4	5
31. French Immersion makes school more interesting for students.	1	2	3	4	5
32. A lot of my friends are Francophones.	1	2	3	4	5
33. I often wonder why I am in a French Immersion program.	1	2	3	4	5
34. Homework is easier for students who are not in a French Immersion program.	1	2	3	4	5
35. French Immersion aids in bringing the French and English people together.	1	2	3	4	5
36. I enjoy speaking French.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
37. I think it is important that Quebec remain a part of Canada.	1	2	3	4	5
38. I enjoy French language radio.	1	2	3	4	5
39. I enjoy French language television.	1	2	3	4	5
40. After grade eight, I would like to proceed to an English language secondary school where several subjects (at each grade level) will be available in French.	1	2	3	4	5
41. After grade eight, I would like to proceed to a bilingual secondary school where all subjects are available in English and French and I can elect to pursue any or all courses in the language of my choice.	1	2	3	4	5
42. I often doubt the merits of keeping up my studies in French.	1	2	3	4	5
43. If something was bothering me about being in French Immersion I would feel comfortable in talking to my parents about it.	1	2	3	4	5
44. If I have difficulty expressing myself in French, my teacher would encourage me to express myself in English.	1	2	3	4	5
45. If I were not in French Immersion I would contribute more ideas and opinions to topics under discussion in the class.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
46. After grade eight I would like to proceed to a French language secondary school.	1	2	3	4	5
47. In French Immersion classes students really help each other.	1	2	3	4	5
48. Outside the classroom I spend a lot of time playing with friends who are not in Immersion.	1	2	3	4	5
49. Most of my close friends speak French.	1	2	3	4	5
50. In our French Immersion classes students participate (asking questions, joining in discussions, etc.) more than in other classes.	1	2	3	4	5
51. I often wonder if I should bother keeping up my studies in French.	1	2	3	4	5

52. After grade eight I plan to take the following number of subjects (each year) in French in secondary school.

No subjects in the French Language 1
1 subject in French 2
2 subjects in French 3
3 subjects in French 4
4 subjects in French 5
5 subjects in French 6
6 subjects in French 7
7 subjects in French 8
All subjects in French 9

53. How many French people do you know (outside of the French Immersion students) well enough to talk to outside of school?

A great many (over fifteen) 1
Quite a few (approximately ten to fifteen) 2
Some (approximately five to ten) 3
Very few (under five) 4

54. How many students in your French Immersion class do you know well enough to spend time with outside the class?

A great many (over 75%) 1
Quite a few (approximately 50% to 75%)... 2
Some (approximately 25% to 50%) 3
Very few (under 25%) 4

SECTION III

Now we would like you to assess your own personal skills. Please circle the number for each question that best describes your situation.

	Not at All	Slightly	Somewhat	Quite Well	Fluently
55. How well do you read French?	1	2	3	4	5
56. How well do you write French?	1	2	3	4	5
57. How well do you speak French?	1	2	3	4	5
58. How well do you understand French when a French Immersion person speaks French?	1	2	3	4	5
59. How well do you understand French when a Franchophone speaks French?	1	2	3	4	5
60. How well do you understand French when you listen to French language radio?	1	2	3	4	5
61. How well do you understand French when you view French language television programs?	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION IV

In this final section, we would like to ask you a few "open ended" questions about French Immersion. Please give written information in the space provided.

62. If courses in the French language are available to you at the secondary school level, what courses would you likely take in French

63. What could teachers do to help French Immersion be better?

64. What would you say has been the greatest success of the French Immersion program?

65. Can French Immersion be improved in any way?

66. What has been the greatest failing of French Immersion in your school?

67. Please feel free to make any additional comments on French Immersion or this questionnaire.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND CO-OPERATION. Have a pleasant summer!

THE ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION
252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1V6 Telephone (416) 923-6641

Department of Sociology in Education

APPENDIX C3

FRENCH IMMERSION STUDY

IMMERSION TEACHER INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

As has been explained to you by your principal, we are researchers at the Ontario Institute For Studies In Education who are looking at various social and program effects of implementing French Immersion in Northern Ontario. The purpose of our study is to make informed recommendations on policies and practices relevant to French Immersion programs. All information is confidential and no ones name will be taken or reported on. One or two of the questions may seem personal. No one, including the researchers, will see your answers to these questions in anything but a statistical form. The reason for the question is to be able to gage accurately how various groups in the North have felt about French Immersion. The questions are asked, therefore, only to insure that the truest picture of how people feel is presented. We are working in a number of Northern Boards and are trying to compare our findings with other information about Immersion programs in Ontario and across Canada. As a result there may be one or two questions not directly related to your situation and there may even be questions asked you before. If this is the case, please answer as best you can. We appreciate your sharing your knowledge with our project and we believe it will aid in the intelligent assessment of factors related to the nature and scope of a wide range of French Immersion programs.

****

For Offic
Use Only

Note: * = Card to be given to respondent.

1. What is your maternal language(mother tongue)?
   1. English
   2. French
   3. Other
      Specify ______

2. What is your level of teaching specialization?
   1. Elementary School Certificate (EST)
   2. High School Assistant Certificate (HSA)
   3. Both
   4. Other (specify) ______

2a. If yes to EST, please list any additional basic qualifications (e.g., French as a second language certificate) that you may have?
(Please indicate if these were taken in English or French)

______

______

______

2b. If you checked HSA, please list any areas of teaching specialization as well as any additional qualifications.
(Please indicate if these were taken in English or French)

______

______

3. How many years have you been teaching full time in Ontario or other school systems?

4. How many of these years were you teaching in programs which were Non-French Immersion?

5. How many years have you been teaching French Immersion students?

6. What specialized training do you have for teaching French Immersion?

    a. Programs specifically designed for teaching French Immersion? Yes ____
    No ____
    Describe ________________________

    b. Pre-service programs. Yes ____
    No ____
    Describe ________________________

    c. Ongoing inservice program Yes ____
    No ____
    Describe ________________________

    d. Other (specify) ________________________
    ____
    ____

7. Do you think this type of training is adequate?
    1. Not adequate
    2. Somewhat adequate
    3. Adequate
    4. More than adequate
    5. Very adequate

7a. Why is (or is not) this type of training adequate?

Comments: ________________________
____

8. Do you think this amount of training is adequate?
    1. Not adequate
    2. Somewhat adequate
    3. Adequate
    4. More than adequate
    5. Very adequate

8a. Why is (or is not) this amount of training adequate?

Comments: ________________________

9. Have you attended French Immersion workshops, seminars, etc.?

1. Yes _____ 2. No _____

If yes, describe: ____

____

10. What grade(s) are you teaching French Immersion?

Pre Kindergarten _____

Kindergarten _____	Grade 5 _____
Grade 1 _____	Grade 6 _____
Grade 2 _____	Grade 7 _____
Grade 3 _____	Grade 8 _____
Grade 4 _____	Other (Specify) _____

11. How many students do you typically teach in these French Immersion classes? Pre-kindergarten _____

Kindergarten _____	Grade 5 _____
Grade 1 _____	Grade 6 _____
Grade 2 _____	Grade 7 _____
Grade 3 _____	Grade 8 _____
Grade 4 _____	Other (specify) _____

12. What grade(s) are you teaching other than in French Immersion programs? Pre-kindergarten _____

Kindergarten _____	Grade 5 _____	Grade 10 _____
Grade 1 _____	Grade 6 _____	Grade 11 _____
Grade 2 _____	Grade 7 _____	Grade 12 _____
Grade 3 _____	Grade 8 _____	Grade 13 _____
Grade 4 _____	Grade 9 _____	Non graded _____
		Multigraded _____
		None _____

13. Please list the subjects that you are presently teaching in the French Immersion program:

List: ____

____

____

14. Please list all the subjects that you are presently teaching in other than French Immersion program?

List: ______________________________

____

____

____

____

15. Do you believe children who are entering French Immersion programs have sufficient knowledge of French to handle homework in the early grades(e.g. first three years)?

1. This presents no problem
2. Is somewhat of a problem
3. Is the same as regular classes
4. Extra effort required makes them work better

16. Do you believe it is easier or harder for French Immersion students to do homework if their parents are fluent in French?

1. Very much easier
2. Easier
3. Same as other
4. Harder
5. Very much harder

17 Do you feel that homework becomes more difficult, easier, or stays the same for French Immersion students whose parents are not fluent in French as the student progresses (by grade) in the program?

1. Most difficult in earlier grades
2. Most difficult in later grades
3. This presents no problem at any time
4. This is somewhat of a problem uniformily throughout the program

18. What grades have you taught prior to French Immersion?

Note: Correspond to Ontario Ministry Of Education classification

0. Did not teach prior to French Immersion
1. Primary division (JK - 3)
2. Junior division (4 - 6)
3. Intermediate division (7 - 10)
4. Senior division (11 - 12)
5. Primary/junior division (JK - 6)
6. Intermediate/senior division (7 - 12)
7. Other (specify) ______________________________

Note: If you did not teach prior to teaching French Immersion please skip to question 20.

19. What subjects (if any) did you teach prior to French Immersion? (Indicate if subjects were taught in English or French)

Please List: ______________________

____

____

____

____

____

20. Who is primarily responsible for determining what teachers will teach (core curriculum) at specific grade levels in French Immersion programs?

1. Curriculum superintendent
2. School principal
3. Classroom teacher
4. Curriculum committees
5. Other (specify) ______________________

21. Would you say that there is continuity from grade to grade in the core curriculum of French Immersion classes and is there a conscious effort to make the concepts and lessons integrate with one another across subject areas within any given grade level?

1. High continuity	1. High integration
2. Some continuity	2. Some integration
3. Little continuity	3. Little integration
4. No continuity	4. No integration

22. What do you think can be done to improve continuity or the integration of the core curriculum in French Immersion programs?

____

____

____

23. Do you currently (or have you in the past sat) sit on any committees involved with setting policy for the establishment of French Immersion programs? (e.g. What is to be done in programs, not implementation question of how this is to be done)

	Yes	No
If no, go to question 26	1	2
If yes, was the involvement in connection with:		
(a) Policy concerning the core content of curriculum	1	2
(b) Policy concerning other issues:		
(i) type of French Immersion program (e.g., late or early immersion, percentage of French/English split, etc.)	1	2
(ii) Whether French Immersion will be established at the secondary level	1	2
(iii) Admission criteria	1	2
(iv) Other (specify) ________________	1	2

24. How frequent would you describe your involvement in these policy groups?

1. Infrequent/slight involvement
2. Regular involvement
3. Extremely frequent

25. How effective was this policy group(s) in producing change?

1. No effect
2. Some effect
3. Great effect

26. Does your school permit students to enter French Immersion programs beyond the initial grade?

1. Yes ____ 2. No ____

Discuss: ____

____

____

27. Do any committees involved in French Immersion activities (including developing or adapting materials for use in the French Immersion programs) exist in your area?

1. Yes ______ 2. No ______

28. Do you currently sit (or have you in the past sat) on any such committees?

1. Yes ______ 2. No _____

29. How active would you describe your involvement in these curriculum development groups?

1. Slight/infrequent involvement
2. Regular involvement
3. Intense involvement

30. How effective do you believe this group is (or was) in developing curriculum instructional materials?

1. Virtually no effect
2. Somewhat effective
3. Effective
4. Very effective

31. Are the French Immersion programs operated by your school open to all students?

1. Yes ____ 2. No _____

Specify: ____

____

____

32. How much involvement would you say immersion parents had with other parents with children in French Immersion prior to enroling their children in immersion.

1. No contact with one another
2. Very little contact with one another
3. Some contact with one another
4. Very familiar with one another

* 33. Are you personally satisfied with the quality of the French Immersion program in the following areas?

	Extremely satisfied	Quite Satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat unsatisfied	Very unsatisfied
1. Course content	1	2	3	4	5
2. Instructional materials	1	2	3	4	5
3. Teaching methods	1	2	3	4	5
4. Testing student performance	1	2	3	4	5
5. Units of studies (program)	1	2	3	4	5

Comment: ____

____

____

34. What percentage of the day would you say is devoted to instruction in French in your classroom? ________

35. What percentage of your students would you say come from ethnic backgrounds other than French or English? _______

36. What percentage of your French Immersion students are from Francophone backgrounds? ________

37. What percentage of your French Immersion students are from Anglophone backgrounds? ________

38. Is busing in your view, any more of a problem in Immersion programs than other programs?

1. Yes ______ 2. No ________

39. If yes to 38; is this because of:

(i) The large geographical area covered
(ii) The academic demands of French Immersion programs
(iii) Both
(iv) Other (specify) ______________________________

40. Based on your experience in your school, could you estimate the percentage of students who transfer or drop out of the French Immersion program? ____________________

41. Would you say that this rate of dropout or transfer is high?

1. Yes _______ 2. No ______

Discuss, particularly in the context of implications for existing programs:

____

____

____

____

* 42. There are several possible reasons for students transferring or dropping out of French Immersion programs. How often would you say each of the following is a problem in transfers or dropouts from French Immersion programs?

		Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
a.	Family moves to new location.	1	2	3	4
b.	Student not achieving well in English	1	2	3	4
c.	Student not achieving well in French (language fluency)	1	2	3	4
d.	Student not achieving well in French (comprehension)	1	2	3	4
e.	Student not achieving in Mathematics.	1	2	3	4
f.	Student not achieving in other academic areas.	1	2	3	4
g.	Student has behavioral problems.	1	2	3	4
h.	Student has speech difficulty (e.g., stuttering).	1	2	3	4
i.	Student has diagnosed learning disability.	1	2	3	4
j.	Limited or inadequate available French remedial service.	1	2	3	4
k.	Student unhappy with pressure at school.	1	2	3	4
l.	Loss of parental confidence in the choice of the program.	1	2	3	4
m.	Parental concern about the child's academic achievement.	1	2	3	4
n.	Perceived lack of ability by parents or teachers of the child to cope with learning a second language.	1	2	3	4
o.	Peer influence.	1	2	3	4
p.	Degree of parental involvement in their child's education.	1	2	3	4
q.	Degree of parental competence in French	1	2	3	4
r.	Student stress.	1	2	3	4
s.	Parental stress.	1	2	3	4
t.	Other (specify) ________________________	1	2	3	4

43. Is this pattern for French Immersion students having problems roughly the same as for students who are not in French Immersion programs?

1. Virtually the same
2. Somewhat the same
3. Same
4. Quite different
5. Very different

Comment: ______________________________

____

44. Have any formal evaluations of your French Immersion program been conducted?

1. Yes _____ 2. No _________

If yes, (a) Please describe type of evaluation.

____

____

____

(b) How effective was this evaluation?

1. Not effective(of no practical use)
2. Mildly effective
3. Quite effective
4. Very effective

45. Is formal evaluation needed?

1. Yes ______ 2. No ___

* 46. Does your school publicize the existence of its French Immersion and bilingual programs with any of the following?

		This method is used	This method is not used
a.	Posters	1	2
b.	Flyers	1	2
c.	Press releases (e.g. TV, radio, other medium)	1	2
d.	Material sent home with children	1	2
e.	Word of mouth (e.g. teachers and parents tell select individuals they feel would be interested but not others)	1	2
f.	Other (specify) ______________	1	2

47. Of the methods of publicizing the Immersion program listed above, which in your opinion has been the most effective?

Why? (describe) ______________________________

____

____

48 Do you believe it is better to have French Immersion programs in dual track schools (French Immersion and English under one roof) or would it be better if French Immersion classes were housed in a French Immersion Centre?

1. Dual track schools
2. French Immersion Centres

* 49. There is some question as to how much contact French Immersion and other Anglophone students should have. Do you think it would be better: (Choose single best answer)

1. Tō have French Immersion program with a separate principal in a separate building from other programs.
2. Have a French Immersion program in a separate part of an Anglophone (English speaking) school as a separate program with a common principal.
3. Have a French Immersion program in a Francophone school with a Francophone principal.
4. Have a French Immersion program which is run such that French Immersion is taken as a class part of the day and Immersion children take other classes with non immersion students the rest of the day but all under the same principal.
5. Those who wish to learn French can attend a French Language school.
6. Other (specify) ____________________________________

* 50. How influential would you say the following groups are in effecting changes in French Immersion programs?

		Not Influential	Somewhat Influential	Influential	Quite Influential	Extremely Influential
a.	Parent of French Immersion students.	1	2	3	4	5
b.	French Immersion students.	1	2	3	4	5
c.	French Immersion teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
d.	Principal.	1	2	3	4	5
e.	School board.	1	2	3	4	5
f.	Parents of students not in French Immersion programs.	1	2	3	4	5
g.	Teachers not teaching French Immersion.	1	2	3	4	5
h.	Media	1	2	3	4	5
i.	The Ministry of Education	1	2	3	4	5

* 51. We understand this is a difficult and somewhat arbitrary task, but could you please rank order from A as most important to J least important, which in your view is most influential in bringing about actual changes in the French Immersion program in your school?

a. Parents of French Immersion students ____
b. French Immersion students ____
c. French Immersion teachers ____
d. Principal ____
e. School board ____
f. Parents of students not in French Immersion program ____
g. Teachers who are not teaching in French Immersion program ____
h. Media ____
i. Ministry of education ____
j. Superintendent of curriculum ____

* 52. Please indicate the relative amount of time you spent on the administrative matters listed below when the operation of an Immersion program is compared to that of a regular program.

	Much More	Somewhat more	About the same	Less time
a. Scheduling and time tabling	1	2	3	4
b. Class size and split grades	1	2	3	4
c. Getting basic program units of studies	1	2	3	4
d. Getting resource materials	1	2	3	4
e. Hiring staff	1	2	3	4
f. Staff relations	1	2	3	4
g. Public relations (e.g., visitors, testing publicity)	1	2	3	4
h. Parents' demands	1	2	3	4
i. Busing and other transportation	1	2	3	4
j. Crowding in the school	1	2	3	4
k. Discipline problems	1	2	3	4
l. Pupil transfers	1	2	3	4
m. Supervision of instruction	1	2	3	4
n. Organizing remedial facilities	1	2	3	4
o. Other (specify) ____________	1	2	3	4

* 53. To what extent are the following factors considered important when hiring French Immersion teachers in your area?

		Very Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant
a.	Candidate is a qualified teacher with previous experience in a French school system.	1	2	3	4
b.	Candidate is a qualified teacher who has specialized training in second language methods	1	2	3	4
c.	Candidate is a qualified teacher who has had training specifically designed for bilingual education.	1	2	3	4
d.	Candidate is a qualified teacher whose mother tongue is French but was not educated in French.	1	2	3	4
e.	Candidate is a qualified teacher whose mother tongue is French and whose elementary and secondary education was French.	1	2	3	4
f.	Candidate is a qualified teacher whose mother tongue is not French but who has demonstrated adequate ability in French.	1	2	3	4
g.	Candidate is a qualified teacher with previous experience in oral French program (e.g., has previously taught French.	1	2	3	4

54. Other than the qualifications needed to teach French, do you think the ability and backgrounds of French Immersion teachers is the same or different than other teachers (not teaching French Immersion) in your school?

1. Very different
2. Somewhat different
3. Same

If different, how so? ________________________________

____

____

55. Do you think that there are French Immersion teachers in your school board who have paper qualifications and have been hired to teach French but who in fact have inadequate ability in French to teach in the program?

1. This never occurs
2. This occasionally occurs
3. Occurs frequently
4. Occurs very frequently

56. Do you have a French language consultant?

1. Yes 2. No

If yes, (Describe his/her responsibliiities; how frequently this person is in your school; how effective this person is, etc.)

57. How important do you believe a French language consultant can be to your Immersion program?

1. No importance
2. Slight importance
3. Important
4. Very important
5. Extremely important

58. Has the existence of the French Immersion program in your board resulted in staff layoffs of English speaking teachers?

1. Yes 2. No

59. Do you think this is a source of worry among English speaking teachers?

1. Not worried/indifferent
2. Somewhat worried
3. Very worried
4. Extremely worried.

60. Do you think the Francophone teachers have worries about Immersion programs?

1. Not worried/indifferent
2. Somewhat worried
3. Very worried
4. Extremely worried.

* 61. There are at times barriers to the implementation of new educational programs: Please comment on the extent to which each of the following is a barrier to developing French Immersion programs.

		Extremely important	Quite important	Important	Somewhat major	Not major
a.	Lack of in-service training to teach French Immersion teachers how to develop their own instructional materials.	1	2	3	4	5
b.	Lack of in-service training to teach French Immersion teachers how to effectively use instructional materials.	1	2	3	4	5
c.	Availability of good instructional materials in French	1	2	3	4	5
d.	Lack of clarity of French Immersion goals	1	2	3	4	5
e.	Lack of clarity on the means to achieve goals.	1	2	3	4	5
f.	Lack of psychological support from school administration	1	2	3	4	5
g.	Lack of psychological support from non-French immersion teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
h.	Lack of administrative resource support (e.g., in service programs)	1	2	3	4	5
i.	Lack of regular meetings to assist teachers to cope with problems related to curriculum development.	1	2	3	4	5
j.	French Immersion teacher turnover rate.	1	2	3	4	5
k.	Lack of educational training related to curriculum development and implementation (e.g., no training at teachers college or faculties of education)	1	2	3	4	5
l.	Lack of collaboration between boards (e.g., public and separate schools do not adequately cooperate)	1	2	3	4	5
m.	Problems of adapting English language materials to French Immersion program needs.	1	2	3	4	5
n.	The amount of time available for French instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
o.	No evaluation tests to show if the program is working well or not.	1	2	3	4	5
p.	Lack of support from the community at large.	1	2	3	4	5
q.	Other(describe) ____________________	1	2	3	4	5

62. Of the items listed in Question 61, please choose the five most important which you think should be given attention. (rank order in order of importance starting with most important)

1. ______________________________
2. ______________________________
3. ______________________________
4. ______________________________
5. ______________________________

63. Are subjects such as history/geography (social studies) given different emphasis or different content when taught in a French Immersion program? (e.g., some say that Immersion courses emphasize Quebec and French (and Francophone societies) over usual emphasis; others say Immersion programs are French content versus process training in orientation) Are either of these problematic?

1. Yes ____ 2. No ____

Discuss: ____

____

____

64. Does your school have a library/resource centre with materials in French for French Immersion students?

1. Yes ____ 2. No ______

If yes, how do you find these materials?

1. Very adequate for students needs
2. More than adequate
3. Adequate
4. Somewhat adequate
5. Not adequate

65. Does your school have the services of a French Remedial teacher available to you?

1. Yes ____ 2. No _____

* 66. The following question attempts to clarify how improvements are brought about in the curriculum of French Immersion programs

How influential are the following knowledge resources from outside the school on French Immersion in terms of bringing about improvements?

		Extremely Influential	Quite Influential	Influential	Somewhat Influential	Not Influential
1.	New ideas from research/literature	1	2	3	4	5
2.	New programs	1	2	3	4	5
3.	New products	1	2	3	4	5
4.	New materials	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Resource personnel from other boards	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Resource personnel from the university community	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Canadian Association of Immersion Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Association of Canadian Parents For French	1	2	3	4	5

* 67. This question attempts to clarify whether certain aspects of school life hinder or enhance the French Immersion program improvement process and how influential is each of these as a hinderance or help?

		Extremely Influential	Quite Influential	Influential	Somewhat Influential	Not Influential	Does this hinder or enhance the improvement process	
							Hinder	Enhance
1.	School community relations	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
2.	Bureaucratic factors	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
3.	Political factors	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
4.	Economic factors	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
5.	Cultural factors	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
6.	The dropout/transfer rate(students)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
7.	Declining enrolment	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
8.	The number of students in the program	1	2	3	4	5	1	2
9.	Teacher turnover rate	1	2	3	4	5	1	2

* 68. How important would you estimate that each of the following was in parents choosing to enrol their children in French Immersion?

		Very Important Consideration	Important consideration	Minor consideration	No influence
a.	Belief it would give better access to jobs	1	2	3	4
b.	Belief it was important to learn another language	1	2	3	4
c.	Belief that mastery of second language is an important part of education	1	2	3	4
d.	It was the only way children can get transported to school	1	2	3	4
e.	Only way children can eat lunch at school	1	2	3	4
f.	Immersion is seen as a form of enrichment	1	2	3	4
g.	French parents who have lost language or culture wish children to regain Francophone identity.	1	2	3	4
h.	Parents believe Canada's future depends upon bilingual citizens where there is some ability in both French and English and an awareness and appreciation of the other culture	1	2	3	4
i.	Immersion is seen as the first step in the child being multilingual.	1	2	3	4
j.	Children's friends were in the program	1	2	3	4
k.	Friends of parent had enroled their child in the Immersion program.	1	2	3	4
l.	Involvement of parent or student with teacher, principal, superintendent, trustee or consultant who convinced them of the programs merit	1	2	3	4
m.	Recommendation of a relative in another community who was involved with Immersion program	1	2	3	4
n.	Other (specify) ______________________	1	2	3	4

69. Would the patterns above be the same for Francophone students in French Immersion as Anglophones?

1. Yes ____ 2. No _____

Discuss: ____

____

____

* 70. Generally, how satisfied/dissatisfied are you with the following aspects of the French Immersion program?

		Extremely satisfied	Satisfied	No Particular Issue	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Quite Unsatisfied
a.	Development of English competence	1	2	3	4	5
b.	Development of competence in French	1	2	3	4	5
c.	Development in subject areas other than language(Note any particular subject)____________________	1	2	3	4	5
d.	Aids in social relations between groups (e.g., understanding French culture and people)	1	2	3	4	5
e.	Opportunities for individual attention, instruction related to child's needs or interests	1	2	3	4	5
f.	Attitude of child (children) to program and school	1	2	3	4	5
g.	Adequacy of facilities - e.g., library, resources, gym	1	2	3	4	5
h.	Communications with home	1	2	3	4	5
i.	Reporting of student progress/achievement	1	2	3	4	5
j.	Quality, frequency of co-curricular and extra-curricular activities	1	2	3	4	5
k.	Program balance (English and French)	1	2	3	4	5
l.	Opportunities for encouragement of extension of use of French beyond the school	1	2	3	4	5
m.	Quality of texts and resources for program given in French	1	2	3	4	5
n.	Continuity of curriculum	1	2	3	4	5

* 71. **Assuming that children in your Immersion program are making satisfactory academic progress as a group and are working comfortably in both languages by Grade 8, how desirable would you see each of the following?**

	Preferred	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
a. That he/she proceed to a French language secondary school where only English is taught in English.	1	2	3
b. That he/she proceed to an English secondary school where several subjects will be available in the French language.	1	2	3
c. That he/she proceed to an English secondary school where all subjects other than French are taught in English, but where continuation of his/her French would be required.	1	2	3
d. That he/she proceed to a secondary school where continuation of French would be entirely optional.	1	2	3
e. Proceed to full Immersion secondary school.	1	2	3
f. Proceed to a bilingual secondary school (e.g. can elect which subjects in French/English)	1	2	3

72. Do you think that non-immersion parents of Anglophones resent or are positive towards immersion programs.

1. Quite resentful
2. Somewhat resentful
3. Indifferent
4. Somewhat supportive
5. Quite supportive

Why? (describe); also how might this attitude be changed? ____________

73. How supportive or resentful do you think Francophones within the community are towards Immersion programs?

1. Quite resentful
2. Somewhat resentful
3. Indifferent
4. Somewhat supportive
5. Quite supportive

Describe why, give any suggestions for how Immersion's image could be made better ____________

74. What could your board do to improve French Immersion programs? (open ended) ____________________

75. What could your principal do to improve French Immersion? (open ended)

76. What could you yourself do to help French Immersion be better? (open ended) ____________________

77. Do you have any other suggestions? (open ended) ____________________

78. What would you say has been the greatest failing of French Immersion in your school? (open ended) ____________________

79. What would you say has been its greatest success? (open ended) ____________________

80. Are you personally in favour of French Immersion?
   1. Very much in favor
   2. In favor
   3. Indifferent
   4. Somewhat not in favor
   5. Not in favor

81. How strongly do you feel your principal backs Immersion programs?
   1. Very supportive
   2. Supportive
   3. Indifferent
   4. Reluctantly supportive
   5. No support

* 82. Please circle the alternative which best describes your own opinion or belief.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Probably Agree	Neutral	Probably Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a.	French Immersion programs are not a good idea because they make children in them different from their friends	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b.	French Immersion programs are not a good idea because they create an elite group.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c.	The money spent on French Immersion would be better spent on improving instruction in French available to students in all English schools	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d.	The money spent on French Immersion would be better spent on improving instruction in French available to students in French language schools.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
e.	The money spent on French immersion would be better spent on improving instruction in all subjects throughout the school system.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
f.	Many children come out of French Immersion programs deficient in English language skills.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
g.	French immersion is the best way for English speaking children to become truly bilingual.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
h.	French immersion makes school more interesting for children.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
i.	The presence of French Immersion in Ontario schools shows Quebec that we are concerned about Canadian Unity.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
j.	A bilingual person is a better educated person.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

* 83. There is some controversy among educators about how much French is enough. Could you aid us in this discussion by giving your views on the following.

	Very Definitely Yes	Yes	Probably Yes	Neutral	Probably No	No	Very Definitely No
a. French Immersion students should be required to use their French in all extra curricular activities where dual language opportunties are available in the community (e.g., join a French verse English hockey league)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Do you feel a student should spend as much time doing French homework as he/she does for any other subject	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Do you feel children have adequate opportunities to practise their French speaking skills in class.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Do you feel school should provide children with more opportunities to travel to locations in Quebec where the majority of the people speak French.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
e. Do you feel that because some children in French Immersion are more fluent in French (because of their backgrounds) that they have an unfair advantage in entering French Immersion programs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
f. Do you feel the French Immersion program in your area should put more emphasis on grammar and reading skills	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
g. Do you feel the French Immersion program in your area should put more emphasis on speaking and listening skills	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
h. Do you feel the teachers in your French Immersion program are capable in French	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
i. Do you feel that other teachers in your French Immersion program are academically well qualified	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

84. How important do you think the French language radio and television is in aiding your French Immersion students master French.

1. Very important
2. Quite important
3. Important
4. Little importance
5. Not important

85. How supportive would you say non-immersion teachers are of immersion programs.

1. Extremely supportive
2. Very supportive
3. Supportive
4. Indifferent
5. Unsupportive

86. How is this support or lack of support shown? (open ended) Describe:

____

____

____

87. Do you think Canada is capable of achieving the goal of bringing the two language groups together through French Immersion programs?

1. Can be very instrumental in achieving these goals
2. Can probably effect these goals.
3. Only minor effect on the achievement of these goals
4. Not able to achieve these goals.

88. In your opinion are French Immersion parents as a group satisfied or dissatisfied with their children's academic progress?

1. Unsatisfied
2. Somewhat unsatisfied
3. Satisfied
4. Very satisfied
5. Extremely satisfied

89. Has your attitude towards French Immersion changed for the better or worse in any way over the last few years?

1. Much better
2. Better
3. Same
4. Somewhat worse
5. Much worse
6. Discuss ______________________________

* 90. How important should each of the following be in selecting who should take French Immersion?

		Extremely Important	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Unimportant	Very Unimportant
a.	Students have to want to come	1	2	3	4	5
b.	The parents have to want their child to come	1	2	3	4	5
c.	Students have to be above average in all subjects including English (late immersion)	1	2	3	4	5
d.	At least one parent is able to speak French	1	2	3	4	5
e.	The parents, if unable to speak French must be willing to learn some French	1	2	3	4	5
f.	The parents will provide their children opportunities to speak French at home and in the community	1	2	3	4	5
g.	Neither parent has fluency in French	1	2	3	4	5
h.	The children do not come from a French/ Francophone home environment	1	2	3	4	5
i.	The student must enter the program in kindergarten	1	2	3	4	5
j.	Intake is controlled by a quota system (e.g., some students are excluded)	1	2	3	4	5

91. Is your Board planning to extend opportunities for learning french into the secondary school level (beyond the regular french courses available in the English language schools) for students presently in the French Immersion program?

1. Yes _____ 2. No ______

If yes, describe:____

____

92. Do you think parents of students presently in the French Immersion program want additional opportunities for learning french extended to the secondary school level?

1. Yes ____ 2. No ______

If yes, what type of programs would they prefer (describe)?__________

____

93. What has your board and school done to assist you to become an immersion teacher? (Describe) (open ended)

____

____

94. Do you think there will be problems in extending French Immersion into high schools?

1. No problems
2. Minimal problems
3. Normal transition
4. Some problems
5. Severe problems

Describe: ______________________________

____

95. Would there be problems to re-integrating French immersion students into unilingual Anglophone elementary school?

1. No problems
2. Minimal problems
3. Normal transition
4. Some problems
5. Severe problems

Describe: ______________________________

____

____

96. How about problems of integration in a unilingual French language high school?

1. No problems
2. Minimal problems
3. Normal transition
4. Some problems
5. Severe problems

Describe: ______________________________

____

____

97. Do you think the subject material given to French Immersion students is different in content from other programs?

1. Very different
2. Somewhat different
3. Same

If different, how so? (describe) ______________________________

____

____

98. Should French Immersion courses be different in content from regular courses?

1. Should be different
2. Should be somewhat the same
3. Should be the same
4. It makes no difference

Why? (describe) ______________________________

____

____

99. All other factors the same, how big an advantage do you think it is for French Immersion students to have parents who have a good working knowledge of French when competing against other immersion students?

1. No disadvantage
2. No advantage
3. Somewhat of an advantage
4. Advantage
5. Substantial advantage

100. If French immersion is expanded to the secondary level, (Anglophone School) what courses do you believe it would be necessary to offer in French? (open ended)

____

____

____

____

101. Do you think the cost of expanding French Immersion to the secondary level is justified compared to other program needs?

1. No justification
2. Minor justification, but not worth it
3. Justifiable
4. Should be a priority
5. Should be the highest priority

Why? Comment ______________________________

____

____

102. Have there been any political or social effects or problems in implementing French Immersion in your community? (open ended)

Describe:

103. If French Immersion is extended to the high schools, how do you think those students not chosen (or not choosing) to go on in immersion will be generallly affected in their progress when they return to the regular curriculum?

1. Will do much better
2. Will do somewhat better
3. No effect
4. Will do somewhat worse
5. Will have major problem adjusting

104. What, if any, are the administrative implications for continuing French Immersion to the intermediate and senior division levels?

Describe:

105. What is the ideal grade to introduce children to French Immersion?

Pre Kindergarten
Grade: Kindergarten 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
12 Uncertain

106. Do you feel French should be optional or compulsory for Anglophone students not in French Immersion programs (circle one in each row)

		Optional	Undecided	Compulsory
(i)	In grades 1 - 3:	1	2	3
(ii)	In grades 4 - 6:	1	2	3
(iii)	In grades 7 - 9:	1	2	3
(iv)	In grades 10 - 12:	1	2	3

PART II

Background and Demographic Data

Thank you for your cooperation. We would now like to ask you some background data. This information is just for statistical purposes. We are placing your questionnaire in an envelope and providing you with this form. Please fill out this form and place it in the envelope and seal it. No record of your name will be kept.

It is extremely important to our being able to make sensible recommendations that you answer as accurately as possible. We recognize that these questions are highly personal but no one including the researchers will see your answers in anything but a statistical form. No one will be able to trace your name.

Our reasons for asking this information is that our study of immersion deal with social aspects and implications of French Immersion programs. Some people contend that as groups that young teachers have different views from older teachers; that rich people relate to school programs differently than poorer people; that protestant may hold different attitudes towards immersion programmes than catholics. To test to see if any of these claims have any truth on the questions we look at we must know what age, income, and other data. Again we are not interested in prying into your personal life, only in seeing that program decisions are based upon accurate information. We both count on and sincerely appreciate your cooperation.

****

107. Religion preference:
1. Protestant
2. Catholic
3. Jewish
4. Islamic
5. None
6. Other (specify) ______________

108. Marital status:
1. Single
2. Married
3. Separated, divorced, widowed(er)
4. Other ___________

109. Sex:
1. Male
2. Female

110. Age:
1. Under 25
2. 25 - 29
3. 30 - 35
4. 36 - 39
5. 40 - 44
6. 45 - 49
7. 50 - 55
8. 56 and over

111. Income Level:
1. 0 - 4,999
2. 5,000 - 9,999
3. 10,000 - 14,999
4. 15,000 - 19,999
5. 20,000 - 24,999
6. 25,000 - 29,999
7. 30,000 - 34,999
8. 35,000 - 39,999
9. 40,000 - 44,999
10. 45,000 and over

112. Which of the following best describes the degrees which you have earned and please indicate by circling the "E" or the "F" next to the degree whether the language of instruction in the program was principally in English or French.

1. BA/BS - E F
2. B. Ed - E F
3. M. Ed - E F
4. MAT/MA E F
5. Ed. D/Ph.D - E F
6. Other (specify) ________ - E F

113. Which of tha following best describes the manner in which you fulfilled the requirements of Ministry of Education Teachers Certification? Please circle whether the program was taken principally in French or English.

1. Attended Teachers College directly from grade 12 or 13 (did not have a University degree.) ...... E or F
2. Attended Teachers College with a B.A. but did not obtain a B. Ed. undertook the elementary school options (e.g., the type of program that specializes in education fo teachers for the primary , junior and intermediate division)........ E or F
3. Attended Teacher College with a B.A. but did not obtain a B.Ed. undertook the secondary school options (e.g., the type of program that specializes in education of teachers for the intermediate and senior division) ....E or F
4. Attended a faculty of education (B. Ed. program) with elementary school options (e.g., they type of program that specializes in education of teachers for the primary, junior and intermediate division) .... E or F
5. Attended a faculty of education (B. Ed. program) with secondary school options (e.g., the type of program that specializes in education of teachers for the intermediate and senior division.) .... E or F
6. Other (describe) ____________________________________ E or F

114. In your opinion, is declining enrolment presently a threat to the ongoing viability of French Immersion programs?

1. Yes ____ 2. No ____

Discuss: ______________________________

115. Please feel free to make any additional comments on French Immersion or this interview.

____

We will be glad to answer any questions you may have.

Thank you.

George E. Burns

George E. Burns

C. Paul Olson

C. Paul Olson

APPENDIX C4

THE ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION

THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY IN EDUCATION

FRENCH IMMERSION STUDY:

(POST IMMERSION)

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Your School Board along with numerous others in Northeastern Ontario is taking part in a study conducted by the Ontario Institute For Studies In Education (the Department of Sociology in Education) to examine the effects of various methods, procedures and strategies for developing and implementing French Immersion programs. The main purpose of this research project is to provide boards with comparative data and policy recommendations in connection with the ongoing development and implementation of Bilingual Education programs.

Three phases of our study have already been completed. Over the past two months we have (a) interviewed all French Immersion principals within your board (b) interviewed all French Immersion teachers within your board, and (c) surveyed French Immersion students in grades 6, 7 and 8.

We have now reached the "parent phase" of the project. The researchers recognize that questionnaires pose some impositions of persons involved. However, we think you will find the questionnaire interesting to answer. Since all participating boards will receive copies of our final report, which will contain concrete data and policy recommendations for enhancing French Immersion programs, your input is vitally important.

All information collected in this study is confidential. In order to ensure confidentiality, please do not sign your name on any part of the questionnaire. Once you have completed the questionnaire, place it in the accompanying envelope, seal the envelope and have your Immersion Child return it to his/her classroom teacher. We have arranged to "pick-up" the sealed envelopes at your child's school. The envelopes will remain sealed until opened by our research team at the Ontario Institute For Studies In Education in Toronto.

Sincerely,

George E. Burns

Dr. George E. Burns

C. Paul Olson

Professor C. Paul Olson

SECTION A

Attitudes and Opinion Section

The following section deals with reasons that influenced your decision to enter your child in immersion and also some questions of personal beliefs. To make sound policy regarding immersion it is important to know how parents feel. In this section we ask you to specify your personal beliefs.

Reasons for enrolment

1. How important would you estimate that each of the following was in your decision to enrol your child in French Immersion? (Please circle the number for each statement that best describes your belief)

		Very Important Consideration	Important Consideration	Minor Consideration	No Influence
(a)	It would give my child a better access to jobs.	1	2	3	4
(b)	It is important to learn another language.	1	2	3	4
(c)	My belief that mastery of second language is an important part of education.	1	2	3	4
(d)	Immersion is a form of enrichment.	1	2	3	4
(e)	French Immersion helps children to regain Francophone identity.	1	2	3	4
(f)	Canada's future depends upon bilingual citizens.	1	2	3	4
(g)	Children's friends were in the program.	1	2	3	4
(h)	My friends had enroled their child in the Immersion program.	1	2	3	4
(i)	Teacher, principal, superintendent, trustee or consultant convinced us of the programs merit.	1	2	3	4
(j)	Recommendation of a relative in another community who was involved with Immersion program.	1	2	3	4
(k)	Other (specify) ______________________	1	2	3	4

Personal Beliefs

2. Please circle the alternative which best describes your own opinion or belief.
Note: If you circle ① that means you strongly agree with the statement. If you circle ⑤ that means you strongly disagree, etc.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a.	French Immersion is the best way for English-speaking children to become truly bilingual.	1	2	3	4	5
b.	French Immersion makes school more interesting for children.	1	2	3	4	5
c.	The presence of French Immersion in Ontario schools shows Quebec that we are concerned about Canadian Unity.	1	2	3	4	5
d.	A bilingual person is a better educated person.	1	2	3	4	5
e.	Cost of expanding French Immersion to the secondary level is well justified compared to other program needs.	1	2	3	4	5
f.	French Immersion programs are not a good idea because they make children in them different from their friends.	1	2	3	4	5
g.	French Immersion programs are not a good idea because they create an elite group.	1	2	3	4	5
h.	The money spent on French Immersion would be better spent on improving instruction in French available to students in all English schools.	1	2	3	4	5
i.	The money spent on French Immersion would be better spent on improving instruction in French available to students in French language schools.	1	2	3	4	5
j.	The money spent on French Immersion would be better spent on improving instruction in all subjects throughout the school system.	1	2	3	4	5
k.	Many children come out of French Immersion programs deficient in English language skills.	1	2	3	4	5

2. (continued)

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
l.	French Immersion courses should be different in content from regular courses.	1	2	3	4	5
m.	French language radio and television is very important in aiding French Immersion students master French.	1	2	3	4	5
n.	My attitude towards French Immersion has changed for the better over the last few years.	1	2	3	4	5
o.	French Immersion aids in bringing the French and the English together.	1	2	3	4	5
p.	There will be problems extending French Immersion to the high school.	1	2	3	4	5
q.	In general, the French community supports immersion.	1	2	3	4	5
r.	Non-immersion teachers worry that Immersion programs limit their funds and may cost their jobs.	1	2	3	4	5
s.	In general, the English community supports Immersion.	1	2	3	4	5
t.	Schools should provide immersion children with opportunities to travel to locations in Quebec where the majority of the people speak French.	1	2	3	4	5
u.	Children in French Immersion who are more fluent in French (because of their backgrounds) than others, have an unfair advantage in entering French Immersion programs.	1	2	3	4	5
v.	The French Immersion program in our area should put more emphasis on grammar and reading skills.	1	2	3	4	5
w.	The French Immersion program in our area should put more emphasis on speaking and listening skills.	1	2	3	4	5
x.	The teachers in our French Immersion program are capable in French.	1	2	3	4	5
y.	Teachers in our French Immersion program are academically well qualified.	1	2	3	4	5
z.	French Immersion should be extended to the secondary level.	1	2	3	4	5
Z.	The cost of expanding French Immersion to the secondary level is justified compared to other program needs.	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION B

In this section we ask you about your experiences, preferances and perceptions as a result of having a child/children enrolled in a French Immersion program. Please circle the code which corresponds to your observations.

SA - Strongly Agree
A - Agree
UN - Undecided
D - Disagree
SD - Strongly Disagree

1.	(1)	Children who enter into French Immersion programs have sufficient knowledge of French to handle homework in the early grades (e.g. the first three years).	SA A UN D SD
	(2)	I believe it is easier for French Immersion students to do homework if their parents are fluent in French.	SA A UN D SD
	(3)	Homework becomes more difficult for French Immersion students whose parents are not fluent in French as the student progresses (by grade) in the program.	SA A UN D SD
	(4)	I had considerable involvement with other parents with children in French Immersion prior to enrolling my child in Immersion.	SA A UN D SD
	(5)	The subject material given to French Immersion students is different in content from other programs.	SA A UN D SD
	(6)	Subjects such as history/geography (social studies) are given different emphasis or different content when taught in a French Immersion program.	SA A UN D SD
	(7)	I find it difficult to assist my immersion child with homework because I have inadequate ability in French.	SA A UN D SD
	(8)	Non Immersion parents of Anglophone students are positive towards the French Immersion program.	SA A UN D SD
	(9)	Francophones within the community are supportive of French Immersion programs.	SA A UN D SD
	(10)	Parents of students presently in the French Immersion program want additional opportunities for learning French extended to the secondary school level.	SA A UN D SD
	(11)	Our Board of Education is planning to extend opportunities for learning french into the secondary level (courses beyond the regular french courses available in English language secondary schools) for students presently in the French Immersion program.	SA A UN D SD

(12) After grade eight, I would like my immersion child to proceed to an English language Secondary School where several subjects (at each grade level) will be available in the French language. SA A UN D SD

(13) After grade eight, I would like my immersion child to proceed to a French language Secondary School where only English as a subject is taught in English. SA A UN D SD

(14) After grade eight, I would like my immersion child to proceed to a bilingual Secondary School where all subjects are available in English and French and where he/she can elect to pursue any or all courses in the language of his/her choice. SA A UN D SD

(15) I suspect that there will not be any problems in extending additional opportunities for learning French to French Immersion students at the secondary school level. SA A UN D SD

(16) When my immersion child moves on to the secondary school level I would like him/her to have whatever opportunities are required to increase his/her French language fluency. SA A UN D SD

(17) French Immersion programs are becoming increasingly popular among ratepayers. SA A UN D SD

(18) Implementing the French Immersion program has progressed smoothly in our community. SA A UN D SD

(19) The French Immersion program is fulfilling the educational expectations that I have for my child. SA A UN D SD

(20) I often doubt the merits of keeping my child in the French Immersion program. SA A UN D SD

(21) I find it easy to discuss my immersion child's progress with school personnel. SA A UN D SD

(22) French Immersion students achieve well in English. SA A UN D SD

(23) Parents of French Immersion students are influential in bringing about changes in the French Immersion program in our school. SA A UN D SD

(24) There are too many students in French Immersion classes. SA A UN D SD

(25) Our school principal is a strong supporter of the French Immersion program. SA A UN D SD

(26) Our Board of Education supports the French Immersion program strongly. SA A UN D SD

(27) My child finds homework a frustrating experience because of inadequate ability in French to cope with homework assignments. SA A UN D SD

(28) Formal evaluation of the French Immersion program (to show if the program is working well or not) is needed. SA A UN D SD

(29) It is better to have French Immersion programs in dual track schools (French Immersion and Non-French Immersion "Anglophone" students in the same building). SA A UN D SD

(30) It is better to have French Immersion programs in dual track schools (French Immersion and Non-French Immersion "Francophone" students in the same building). SA A UN D SD

(31) It is better to have French Immersion classes housed in a French Immersion Centre (a school in which there are only French Immersion students). SA A UN D SD

(32) Those who wish to learn French should attend a French language school. SA A UN D SD

(33) French Immersion (the type of program available to students in grade six) should be extended to grades 7 & 8. SA A UN D SD

(34) The amount of instruction in French in grades 7 & 8 at the Post Immersion program is adequate. SA A UN D SD

(35) The amount of instruction in French should be increased in grades 7 & 8 of the Post Immersion program. SA A UN D SD

2. There is some question as to how much contact French Immersion and Non-Immersion students should have in school settings. (Choose the single best answer). It is better to:

(a) Have a French Immersion program with a separate principal in a separate building from other programs.

(b) Have a French Immersion program in a separate part of an Anglophone (English speaking) school as a separate program with a common principal.

(c) Have a French Immersion program in a Francophone school with a Francophone principal.

(d) Have a French Immersion program which is run such that French Immersion is taken as a class part of the day and Immersion children take other classes with non-immersion students the rest of the day but all under the same principal.

(e) Other (specify) ______________________________

____

____

3. What is the name of your immersion child's school? ______________

____

SECTION C

Now we would like to ask you a few "open ended" questions about French Immersion. For each item please give written information in the space provided. If there is insufficient space, you may wish to write on the back of the page.

1. If French Immersion is expanded to the secondary level, (Anglophone School) what courses do you believe it would be necessary to offer in French?

2. What could your board do to improve French Immersion programs?

3. What could your principal do to improve French Immersion?

4. What could teachers do to help French Immersion be better?

5. Do you have any other suggestions about French Immersion?

6. What would you say has been the greatest failing of French Immersion in your school?

7. What would you say has been its greatest success?

SECTION D

Background and Demographic Data

The purpose of this section is to obtain background data on you and your spouse. This information while important is just for statistical purposes. Our reasons for asking this information is that our study of French Immersion deals with social aspects and implications of French Immersion programs. Please answer each question as accurately as you can.

THANK YOU

1. What is the maternal tongue of yourself and your spouse?

	Self	Spouse
1. French	☐	☐
2. English	☐	☐
3. Other	☐	☐

2. Please rate your own skills (and the skills of your spouse) on the following scales by circling the alternative that best describes your situations.

	Not at All 1	Slightly 2	Somewhat 3	Quite Well 4	Fluently 5
(a) **Read French**					
Yourself	1	2	3	4	5
Spouse	1	2	3	4	5
(b) **Write French**					
Yourself	1	2	3	4	5
Spouse	1	2	3	4	5
(c) **Speak French**					
Yourself	1	2	3	4	5
Spouse	1	2	3	4	5
(d) **Understand French**					
Yourself	1	2	3	4	5
Spouse	1	2	3	4	5

3. What is the sex of the person(s) responding to this questionnaire?
☐ Male
☐ Female
☐ Jointly completed

4. What is your occupation? (Please be specific: mechanic; bus driver; college instructor; small business owner; homemaker, etc.)

____

5. What is the occupation of your spouse? (Be specific)

____

6. Circle the catagory that describes your family's combined income from all sources.

1. 0 - 4,999
2. 5,000 - 9,999
3. 10,000 - 14,999
4. 15,000 - 19,999
5. 20,000 - 24,999
6. 25,000 - 29,999
7. 30,000 - 34,999
8. 35,000 - 39,999
9. 40,000 - 44,999
10. 45,000 - 49,999
11. 50,000 - 54,999
12. 55,000 or more

7. Religious Preference:

	Self	Spouse
1. Protestant	☐	☐
2. Roman Catholic	☐	☐
3. Other (specify)	☐	☐
4. None	☐	☐

8. Are you:
☐ Public school supporter
☐ Separate school supporter

9. If a Separate school supporter, are your immersion children housed in:
☐ A French language school in which there is French Immersion.
☐ An English language school in which there is French Immersion.
☐ A French Immersion school in which there are only French Immersion students.

10. Which of these was the last school that you and your spouse attended? Please place a check ✓ mark in the box that best describes your situations.

	You yourself		Spouse	
	Some	Graduated	Some	Graduated
No formal schooling				
Public/Grade School				
Secondary School				
University (Please indicate highest degree)				
Community College				
CEGEP				
Other (please specify)				

11. Give the year you were born: 19____

12. Give the year your spouse was born: 19____

13. Marital status: ☐ Single ☐ Married ☐ Widowed(er) ☐ Divorced ☐ Separated ☐ Other ________

14. Number of people in your household: ________

15. Please list all your children in school by giving their grade and sex:

	Child's Grade	Sex	Class Size		Child's Grade	Sex	Class Size
(1)		M F		(4)		M F	
(2)		M F		(5)		M F	
(3)		M F		(6)		M F	

(If necessary please use back)

16. If the child(ren) is (or was) in immersion, please give the child's current grade; class size; sex and the grade entered immersion. Also give the highest grade the child has gone to or will go to in Immersion.

	Current Grade	Class Size	Sex	Grade Entered	Highest Grade		Current Grade	Class Size	Sex	Grade Entered	Highest Grade
(1)			M F			(4)			M F		
(2)			M F			(5)			M F		
(3)			M F			(6)			M F		

(If necessary please use back)

17. Please feel free to make any additional comments on French Immersion or this questionnaire.

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

> Please place this completed questionnaire in the accompanying envelope; seal the envelope and ask your immersion child to return it to his/her classroom teacher. Our research team has made arrangements to pick-up the sealed envelopes at the school later this week.

Thank you for your time and co-operation.

George E. Burns
Dr. George E. Burns

C. Paul Olson
Professor C. Paul Olson

APPENDIX D

ENROLMENT FIGURES SHOWING ENROLMENT PATTERNS (AND INCREASES) FOR FRENCH IMMERSION FROM A NORTHERN ONTARIO INTERMEDIATE SIZE BOARD

The board from which these data were collected was not necessarily directly involved in the existing study.

Enrolment Pattern in Immersion Schools in September 1981 for a Board in Northern Ontario

	JK	SK	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
SCHOOL A	14	20	11	13	13	6	15	14	8
	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	15	9
	7	9	14	13	12	5	9	6	2
	0	0	2	1	1	1	2	0	2
	21	29	27	27	27	12	36	35	21
SCHOOL B	25	29	23	19	18	20			
	25	29	23	19	18	20			
SCHOOL C	10	6	9	7	3	10	5	5	1
	24	30	18	19	9	17	12	11	10
	34	36	27	26	12	27	17	16	11
SCHOOL D	43	39	27	30	24	14	25	16	-
	19	15	21	22	13	14	12	11	-
	8	7	3	4	7	1	2	2	-
	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	-
	70	61	51	56	45	29	38	32	-
SCHOOL E	10	17	13	11	6	13	-	-	-
	5	10	9	7	7	1	-	-	-
	15	27	22	18	13	14	-	-	-
SCHOOL F	35	35	36	26	20	16	20	-	-
	35	35	36	26	20	16	20	-	-
SCHOOL G	20	20	21	9	21	15	8	13	8
	2	2	4	0	3	2	1	2	1
	22	22	25	9	24	17	9	15	9

French Immersion Projected Enrolment to 1982 for a Board in Northern Ontario

		JK	SK	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	ELEM. TOTAL	SEC. TOTAL
SCHOOL A	*Sept. '81*	10.5	14.5	27	27	27	12	36	35	21	–	–	–	210	–
	Sept. '82	10.5	14.5	28	26	26	26	22	35	34	20	–	–	242	–
	Sept. '83	10.5	14.5	28	27	25	25	35	21	34	33	19	–	272	19
SCHOOL B	*Sept. '81*	12.5	14.5	23	19	18	20	–	–	–	–	–	–	107	–
	Sept. '82	12.5	14.5	28	22	18	17	–	–	–	–	–	–	112	–
	Sept. '83	12.5	14.5	28	27	21	17	–	–	–	–	–	–	120	–
SCHOOL C	*Sept. '81*	17	18	27	26	12	27	17	16	11	–	–	–	171	–
	Sept. '82	17	18	35	26	25	11	26	16	15	10	–	–	199	–
	Sept. '83	17	18	35	34	25	24	10	25	15	14	10	–	217	10
SCHOOL D	*Sept. '81*	35	30.5	51	56	45	29	38	32	–	–	–	–	316.5	–
	Sept. '82	35	38	60	50	55	44	28	37	31	–	–	–	378	–
	Sept. '83	35	38	37	59	49	54	43	27	36	30	–	–	408	–
SCHOOL E	*Sept. '81*	7.5	13.5	22	18	13	14	–	–	–	–	–	–	88	–
	Sept. '82	9	9	26	21	17	13	24	–	–	–	–	–	119	–
	Sept. '83	9	10	17	25	20	16	23	24	–	–	–	–	144	–
SCHOOL F	*Sept. '81*	17.5	17.5	36	26	20	16	20	–	–	–	–	–	153	–
	Sept. '82	17.5	18.5	34	35	25	19	15	19	–	–	–	–	183	–
	Sept. '83	17.5	18.5	36	33	34	24	18	14	18	–	–	–	213	–
SCHOOL G	*Sept. '81*	10	11	25	9	25	17	9	15	9	–	–	–	130	–
	Sept. '82	11	11	21	24	8	24	16	8	14	8	–	–	145	–
	Sept. '83	11	12	21	20	23	8	23	15	8	14	8	–	155	8

APPENDIX E

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND INFORMATION FROM THE OISE BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROJECT

BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROJECT

Director: Merrill Swain
Staff: Henri C. Barik (Evaluation), Sharon Lapkin (Liaison and Information), Birgit Harley and Jill Kamin (Research) and Charlotte Nadeau (Secretary)

The Bilingual Education Project was initiated as a ten year longitudinal study in 1970-71 in response to requests from a number of Boards of Education for help in evaluating French immersion programs which had been initiated in some Ontario schools. The Project is funded jointly by the Office of Research and Development, OISE, and by a Grant-in-Aid from the Ministry of Education of Ontario. The scope of the Project's research includes four major components: program evaluation, curriculum development and evaluation, psycholinguistic studies, and dissemination.

Program Evaluation. The ongoing evaluations focus on early total French immersion programs, and early partial and late partial immersion programs in schools of six boards of education in Ontario. In the sixth year of the longitudinal study, the findings indicate that immersion is a successful educational experience. These findings are described in detail in papers and reports produced by the Project.

Curriculum Development and Evaluation. The Project has produced some materials (centres d'intérêt and jeux linguistiques) which can be considered as prototypical units. These materials are evaluated through workshops and discussions with teachers who have 'test taught' them. Because of the demand for information on materials suitable for use in immersion programs, an evaluative survey of materials used in Kindergarten through Grade 6 has been undertaken. The survey will be extended to higher grade levels in the future.

Psycholinguistic Studies. Because of the lack of suitable measures of French achievement in an immersion context, tests of French listening comprehension, reading and writing skills, and oral skills have been developed. Two of these, the French Comprehension Test (Primer and Grade 1 levels) have been published, and many are being used in immersion and bilingual programs throughout Ontario and the other Canadian provinces.

Dissemination. Each year meetings are held to present the findings of the evaluation in each of the six boards of education to parents, teachers and educators. The Project also tries to respond to requests for help and advice on the initiation and organization of French immersion programs by other boards of education by making its staff available for consultation and participation in workshops and meetings of various sorts.

For further information on any of the Project's activities, please contact Sharon Lapkin, Room N1053 (923-6641, ext. 644)

The Bilingual Education Project
Modern Language Centre
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
252 Bloor Street West, Toronto M5S 1V6

Bilingual Education Project

JUNE 1980

Due to reduced funding, the Bilingual Education Project only provides copies of unpublished papers listed here. The charges indicated will help defray the costs of photocopying. For published articles, please refer to the journal or book cited.

1. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESEARCH DOCUMENTS

1.1 Ottawa Study

* 1.1.1 Barik, H.C., & Swain, M. Three-Year Evaluation of a Large Scale Early Grade French Immersion Program: The Ottawa Study. *Language Learning*, 1975, 25(1), 1-30.

* 1.1.2 Swain, M., & Barik, H.C. A Large Scale Program in French Immersion: The Ottawa Study through Grade Three. *ITL, A Review of Applied Linguistics*, 1976, 33, 1-25.

* 1.1.3 Barik, H.C., & Swain, M. French Immersion in Canada: The Ottawa Study through Grade Four. *ITL, A Review of Applied Linguistics*, 1977, 36, 45-70.

* 1.1.3.1 Barik, H.C., & Swain, M. Programmes d'immersion en français en Ontario: résultats d'une étude. *Bulletin de la F.I.P.F.* (Fédération Internationale des Professeurs de Français), 1976, 12-13, 75-83.

** 1.1.4 Swain, M., & Barik, H.C. *Five Years of Primary French Immersion: Annual Reports of the Bilingual Education Project to the Carleton Board of Education and the Ottawa Board of Education up to 1975*. Toronto: Ministry of Education, Ontario, 1976 (order from OISE Publication Sales). (See NOTE below.)

* 1.1.5 Swain, M. English-Speaking Child + Early French Immersion = Bilingual Child? *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 1976, 33(2), 180-187.

* 1.1.6 Barik, H.C., & Swain, M. Evaluation of a French Immersion Program: The Ottawa Study through Grade Five. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 1978, *10*(3), 192-201.

1.1.7 Swain, M., & Barik, H.C. Report to Ottawa Board of Education and Carleton Board of Education Re: Evaluation of the 1976-77 French Immersion Program in Grades 4-6. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1977 (mimeo). $2.00

1.1.8 Andrew, C.M., Lapkin, S., & Swain, M. Report on the 1978 Evaluation of the Ottawa and Carleton French Immersion Programs, Grades 5-7. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1979 (mimeo). $2.00

1.1.9 Lapkin, S., Andrew, C.M., Harley, B., Swain, M., & Kamin, J. The Immersion Centre and the Dual-Track Schools: A Study of the Relationship between School Environment and Achievement in a French Immersion Program. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1979 (mimeo). $2.00

1.1.10 Andrew, C.M., Lapkin, S., & Swain, M. Report on the 1979 Evaluation of the Ottawa and Carleton Early French Immersion Programs, Grades 6 and 8. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1980 (mimeo). $2.00

NOTE: The published document listed as item 1.1.4 above includes initial versions of reports relating to the Ottawa Study through Grade 4, as well as item 3.9.

1.2 *Toronto Study* (Allenby Public School)

* 1.2.1 Barik, H.C., & Swain, M. Early Grade French Immersion Classes in a Unilingual English Canadian Setting: The Toronto Study. *Scientia Paedagogica Experimentalis*, 1976, *12*(2), 153-177.

* 1.2.2 Barik, H.C., & Swain, M. Primary-Grade French Immersion in a Unilingual English-Canadian Setting: The Toronto Study through Grade 2. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 1976, *1*(1), 39-58.

* 1.2.3 Barik, H.C., & Swain, M. Update on French Immersion: The Toronto Study through Grade 3. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 1976, *1*(4), 33-42.

* 1.2.4 Barik, H.C., & Swain, M. Follow-up on French Immersion: The Toronto Study through Grade Four. *Scientia Paedagogica Experimentalis*, 1978, *15*(2), 181-206.

1.2.5 Barik H.C., & Swain, M. Report to the Toronto Board of Education Re: Evaluation of the 1976-77 French Immersion Program in Grades 3-5 at Allenby Public School. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1978 (mimeo). $2.00

1.2.6 Andrew, C.M., Lapkin, S., & Swain, M. Report on the 1978 Evaluation of the French Immersion Program at Allenby Public School in Toronto, Grades 4-6. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1979 (mimeo). $2.00

1.2.7 Andrew, C.M., Lapkin, S., & Swain, M. Report on the 1979 Evaluation of a French Immersion Program and an Extended French Program in the Toronto Board of Education, Grades 5-8. The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1980 (mimeo). $2.00

1.3. Elgin Study

* 1.3.1 Barik, H.C., & Swain, M. English-French Bilingual Education in the Early Grades: The Elgin Study. *Modern Language Journal*, 1974, *58*, 392-403.

* 1.3.2 Barik, H.C., & Swain, M. English-French Bilingual Education in the Early Grades: The Elgin Study through Grade Four. *Modern Language Journal*, 1976, *60*, 3-17.

* 1.3.3 Barik, H.C., Swain, M., & Nwanunobi, E. English-French Bilingual Education: The Elgin Study through Grade Five. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 1977, *33*(4), 459-475.

* 1.3.4 Barik, H.C., & Swain, M. Evaluation of a Bilingual Education Program in Canada: The Elgin Study through Grade Six. *Bulletin CILA*, 1978, *27*, 31-58.

1.3.5 Barik, H.C., & Swain, M. Report to the Elgin County Board of Education Re: Evaluation of the 1976-77 Partial French Immersion Program in Grades 5-7. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1977 (mimeo). $2.00

* 1.3.6 Lapkin, S., & Stinson, R. Learning in French for Half the Day. *Orbit*, 1978, *42*, 3-7.

1.3.7 Andrew, C.M., Lapkin, S., & Swain, M. Report to the Elgin County Board of Education on the 1978 Evaluation of the Partial French Immersion Programs in Grades 3, 6, 7 and 8. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1979 (mimeo). $2.00

1.3.8 Swain, M., Lapkin, S., & Hanna, G. Report to the Elgin County Board of Education on the 1979 Evaluation of the Partial French Immersion Programs in Grades 4, 7 and 8. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1980 (mimeo). $2.00

1.4. Peel Study

* 1.4.1 Barik, H.C., & Swain, M. A Canadian Experiment in Bilingual Education: The Peel Study. Foreign Language Annals, 1976, 9, 465-479.

* 1.4.2 Barik, H.C., Swain, M., & Gaudino, V. A Canadian Experiment in Bilingual Education in the Senior Grades: The Peel Study through Grade 10. International Review of Applied Psychology, 1976, 25, 99-113.

1.4.3 Swain, M. L2 and Content Learning: A Canadian Bilingual Education Program at the Secondary Grade Levels. In E. Brière (Ed.), Language Development in a Bilingual Setting, Los Angeles: National Dissemination and Assessment Center, 1979, 113-120. $2.00

* 1.4.4 Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. Beginning French Immersion at Grade 8. Orbit, 1977, 39, 10-13.

1.4.5 Andrew, C.M., & Lapkin, S., & Swain, M. Report to the Peel County Board of Education on the 1978 Evaluation of the Late French Immersion (LFI) Program in Grades 8, 11, 12 and 13. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1980 (mimeo). $2.00

1.4.6 Lapkin, S., Swain, M., Kamin, J., & Hanna, G. Report on the 1979 Evaluation of the Peel County Late French Immersion Program, Grades 8, 10, 11 and 12. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1980 (mimeo). $2.50

1.5. Cornwall Study

* 1.5.1 Swain, M., & Barik, H.C. The Role of Curricular Approach, Rural-Urban Background, and Socio-economic Status in Second Language Learning: The Cornwall Area Study. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 1978, 24, 1-16.

2. OTHER RESEARCH DOCUMENTS: GENERAL

2.1 Bilingual Education Project. Activity Areas and Goals of Education, Carleton Board of Education. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1973 (mimeo). $2.00

• 2.2 Swain, M. (Ed.) Bilingual Schooling: Some Experiences in Canada and the United States. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1972 (may be ordered from OISE Publication Sales).

• 2.3 Swain, M., & Barik, H.C. French Immersion Classes: A Promising Route to Bilingualism. Orbit, 1973, 4(16), 3-5.

• 2.4 **Swain, M.** French Immersion Programs Across Canada: Research Findings. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 1974, 31(2), 117-129.

• 2.5 Swain, M. More about Primary French Immersion Classes. Orbit, 1975, 27, 13-15.

•• 2.6 Swain, M., & Barik, H. Bilingual Education in Canada: French and English. In B. Spolsky & R.L. Cooper (Eds.). Case Studies in Bilingual Education. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1978, Pp. 22-71. Excerpts of this chapter available upon request. $1.00

•• 2.7 Swain, M. Some Issues in Bilingual Education in Canada. In A. Valdman (Ed.), Identité Culturelle et Francophonie dans les Amériques. Québec, P.Q.: Presses Université Laval, 1976, 37-43. (ED 121 054)

•• 2.8 Swain, M., & Barik, H.C. Bilingual Education for the English Canadian: Recent Developments. In A. Simoes, Jr. (Ed.), The Bilingual Child: Research and Analysis of Existing Educational Themes. New York: Academic Press, 1976, 91-111.

• 2.9 Cohen, A.D., & Swain, M. Bilingual Education: The 'Immersion' Model in the North American Context. Reprinted in J.E. Alatis & K. Twaddell (Eds.), English as a Second Language in Bilingual Education, Washington, D.C.: TESOL, 1976, 55-63 TESOL Quarterly, 1976, 10(1), 45-53.

2.10 Swain, M. School Reform Through Bilingual Education: Problems and Some Solutions in Evaluating Programs. In J. Simmons & R.G. Paulston (Eds.), Comparative Education Review, October 1978, 420-433. $1.00

•• 2.11 Swain, M., & Bruck, M. (Guest Eds.) Proceedings of the Research Conference on Immersion Education for the Majority Child, The Canadian Modern Language Review, Special Issue, 1976, 32, entire No. 5.

• 2.12 Swain, M. Bilingualism Through Education: Dreams & Realities. Manitoba Modern Language Bulletin, 1977, 11(3), 3-10.

2.13 Bilingual Education Project. List of French Immersion Programs in Canada. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1977 (mimeo). $2.00

• 2.14 Swain, M. Bilingualism -- Some Non-Political Issues. Multiculturalism, 1(3), 1977, 13-16.

• 2.15 Swain, M. French Immersion: Early, Late or Partial? Canadian Modern Language Review, 1978, 34, 577-585.

• 2.16 Swain, M. Home-School Language Switching. In J. Richards (ed.), Understanding Second and Foreign Language Learning: Issues and Approaches. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1978, 238-251.

• 2.17 **Swain, M.** Bilingual Education for the English-Canadian. In J.E. Alatis (ed.), Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1978. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1978, 141-154.

2.18 Lapkin, S. Bilingual Education in Ontario: Issues and Directions. Interchange, 1979, 9(4), 11-19. $2.00

* 2.19 What does Research Say about Immersion Education? In B. Mlacak and E. Isabelle (Eds.), So You Want Your Child To Learn French! Ottawa: Canadian Parents for French, 1979, 20-27.

* 2.20 Swain, M. Bilingual Education: Research and its Implications. In C.A. Yorio, K. Perkins & J. Schachter (Eds.), On Tesol '79: The Learner in Focus. Washington, D.C.: TESOL, 1979, 23-33.

2.21 Swain, M. Target Language Use in the Wider Environment as a Factor in its Acquisition. Paper presented at the 13th Annual TESOL Convention, March 1979. (To be published by Newbury House.) $2.00

2.22 Szamosi, M., Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. Do Early Immersion Pupils 'Know' French? Orbit, October 1979, 49, 20-23. $2.00

3. OTHER RESEARCH DOCUMENTS: PSYCHOLINGUISTIC

** 3.1 Stern, H.H., & Swain, M. Notes on Language Learning in Bilingual Kindergarten Classes, In G. Rondeau (Ed.), Current Trends in Canadian Applied Linguistics, Montréal: Centre éducatif et culturel, 1974.

** 3.2 Swain, M. Bilingualism, Monolingualism and Code Acquisition. In W.F. Mackey and T. Andersson (Eds.). Bilingualism in Early Childhood. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, 1977, 28-35.

** 3.3 Swain, M., Naiman, N., & Dumas, G. Aspects of the Learning of French by English-Speaking Five Year Olds. In E. Hatch (Ed.), Second Language Acquisition. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1978, 297-309.

* 3.4 Swain, M., Dumas, G., & Naiman, N. Alternatives to Spontaneous Speech: Elicited Translation and Imitation as Indicators of Second Language Competence. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 1974, 3, 68-79. (ED 123 872)

* 3.5 Swain, M., & Wesche, M. Linguistic Interaction: Case Study of a Bilingual Child. Language Sciences, 1975, 37, 17-22.

** 3.6 Dumas, G., Swain., & Selinker, L. L'Apprentissage du français language seconde en classe d'immersion dans un milieu Torontois. In S. Carey (Ed.), Bilingualism, Biculturalism and Education. Edmonton: Univ. of Alberta Press, 1974, 83-90.

** 3.7 Swain, M. Child Bilingual Language Learning and Linguistic Interdependence, In S. Carey (Ed.), Bilingualism, Biculturalism and Education. Edmonton: Univ. of Alberta Press, 1974, 75-81.

* 3.8 Selinker, L., Swain, M., & Dumas, G. The Interlanguage Hypothesis Extended to Children. Language Learning, 1975, 25(1), 139-152.

* 3.9 Swain, M. Writing Skills of Grade Three French Immersion Pupils. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 1975, 7, 1-38. (ED 125 262)

** 3.10 Swain, M. Changes in Errors: Random or Systematic? In G. Nickel (Ed.) Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress of Applied Linguistics, Volume 2, Stuttgart: Hochschulverlag, 1976, 345-358.

* 3.11 Swain, M., & Burnaby, B. Personality Characteristics and Second Language Learning in Young Children: A Pilot Study. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 1976, 11, 115-128. (ED129078)

* 3.12 Tarone, E., Swain, M., & Fathman, A. Some Limitations to the Classroom Applications of Current Second Language Acquisition Research. TESOL Quarterly, 1976, 10(1), 19-32.

* 3.13 Swain, M., Lapkin, S., & Barik, H.C. The Cloze Test as a Measure of Second Language Proficiency for Young Children. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 1976, 11, 32-42. (ED129076)

* 3.14 Barik, H.C., & Swain, M. A Longitudinal Study of Bilingual and Cognitive Development. International Journal of Psychology, 1976, 11(4), 251-263.

3.15 Swain, M. Future Directions in Second Language Research. In Proceedings of the Los Angeles Second Language Acquisition Forum, ESL Section, UCLA, 1977, 15-28. $2.0

* 3.16 Lapkin, S., & Swain, M. The Use of English and French Cloze Tests in a Bilingual Education Program Evaluation: Validity and Error Analysis. Language Learning, 1977, 27(2), 279-314.

* 3.17 Chaudron, C. Teacher's Priorities in Correcting Learners' Errors in French Immersion Classes. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 1977, 12, 21-44.

* 3.18 Chaudron, C. A Descriptive Model of Discourse in the Corrective Treatment of Learners' Errors. Language Learning, 1977, 27(1), 29-46.

* 3.19 Harley, B., & Swain, M. An Analysis of the Verb System Used by Young Learners of French. Interlanguage Studies Bulletin, 1978, 3(1), 35-79.

* 3.20 Harley, B., & Swain, M. An Analysis of Verb Form and Function in the Speech of French Immersion Pupils. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 1977, 14, 31-46.

Lapkin, S. An Analysis of French Verb Errors made by Second Language Learners in a Bilingual Program. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 1979, 2(2), 65-84. $2.00

Harley, B., & Swain, M. Form and Function in a Second Language: A Close Look at the Verb System. Paper presented at the 5th International Congress of Applied Linguistics, Montreal, 1978.	$2.00
Swain, M., & Cummins, J. Bilingualism, Cognitive Functioning and Education. *Language Teaching and Linguistics: Abstracts*, 1979, 4-18.	$2.00
Lapkin, S. The English Writing Skills of French Immersion Pupils at Grade Five. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1979 (mimeo).	$2.00

4. PUBLISHED TESTS

4.1 Barik, H.C. *French Comprehension Test, Primer* (Test and Test Manual). Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1976 (order from OISE Publication Sales).

4.2 Barik, H.C. *French Comprehension Test, Level 1* (Test and Teacher's Manual). Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1975. (Teacher's Manual revised, 1976.) (Order from OISE Publication Sales).

4.3 Barik, H.C., & Swain, M. (with Schloss, B.) *Tests de Lecture: Tests of French Reading Comprehension for Grades 2-6*. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1979.

5. CURRICULUM MATERIALS SURVEY K-6

This survey of published and unpublished materials in use in established French immersion programs is based on intensive interviews with teachers and French consultants involved in immersion education. The inventory of materials used at each grade level for French language arts as well as all subject areas taught in French includes about 150 items with bibliographical details, information on format, contents, stated purposes, and evaluative comments. (Available from OISE Publication Sales).

6. CURRICULUM MATERIALS

6.1 Centres d'intérêt ($2.00 each)

6.1.1 La chèvre de M. Seguin
.2 Cadet Rousselle
.3 L'ours et la souris
.4 Pot Pourri

.5 Itok, enfant esquimau
.6 La cabane à sucre
.7 Le carnaval de Québec
.8 Le coq, la poule et la vache

.9 Le Petit Poucet
.10 Le chat botté

6.2 **Jeux linguistiques** - grammar games for use in grades K-4 of intensive or immersion programs, and also helpful for the later grades of core French programs (available from OISE Publication Sales).

* Articles marked by an asterisk have been published and can be consulted in the reviews cited.

** These documents appear in published books. The sources should be consulted, as copies are unavailable.

Any of the above unpublished documents can be ordered from:

BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROJECT, MLC
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
252 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1V6
CANADA

NAME

ADDRESS CITY PROV./COUNTY

PLEASE ENCLOSE A CHEQUE WITH ORDER FORM, PAYABLE TO THE ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION

BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROJECT

The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

FRENCH TESTS DEVELOPED FOR EARLY GRADE FRENCH IMMERSION PROGRAMS

(A) Published Tests Available from OISE Publication Sales

NOTE: Orders of $20.00 and under must be prepaid.

French Comprehension Test, Primer and Level 1

These tests are designed to measure listening comprehension at the kindergarten and grade 1 levels. Information on norms is contained in the test manuals.

Primer Level - Tests (pkg 35) cat. no. 1130/$11.25
Test manual cat. no. 1131/$3.50
Test tape (optional) cat. no. 1132/$10.00

Level 1 - Tests (pkg 35) cat. no. 1115/$11.25
Test manual cat. no. 1116/$3.50
Test tape (optional) cat. no. 1117/$10.00

Tests de Lecture: French Reading Comprehension Tests for Grades 2-6

These tests are designed for grades 2-6 of early French immersion programs. The test manual contains reproductions of the tests as well as norms and may be purchased as an examination copy.

Test 2e (pkg 35) cat. no. 1181/$7.50
Test 3e (pkg 35) cat. no. 1182/$10.95
Test 4e (pkg 35) cat. no. 1183/$10.95
Test 5e/6e (pkg 35) cat. no. 1184/$10.95
Test manual cat. no. 1180/$3.50

(B) Unpublished Tests Available from the Bilingual Education Project

The tests listed below have been developed primarily for the intermediate grades.

✓ * Test de compréhension auditive, niveaux A et B

(Test, test tape, taped directions, answer key) Cost: $6.00 per level

This test and the test de compréhension de l'écrit have been designed to replicate real life communicative settings. The test tape includes items from radio announcements, weather forecasts, advertisements, and so on.

IMPORTANT NOTE: The Bilingual Education Project has permission to use items recorded from CJBC in Toronto for our own evaluation needs. For this reason, all data obtained from the use of the Tests de compréhension auditive must be sent to us, and the test must not be reproduced or published.

✓ * **Test de compréhension de l'écrit, niveaux A et B**

(Test, administration instructions, answer key) Cost: $200 [redacted] per level

This test includes written items such as newspaper articles, advertisements, excerpts from a story and so on.

✓ **Test de mots à trouver, niveaux A, B, C et D**

(Test, instructions, answer key)

This cloze procedure test is designed to serve as an overall measure of second language proficiency. The test consists of a passage of prose from which every seventh word has been deleted.

* Permission to use these tests must be obtained from the Bilingual Education Project. Written requests from a Board official must include assurance that the confidentiality of the tests will be maintained, that the Bilingual Education Project will be acknowledged in any report containing data obtained from the use of these tests and that results of the testing will be sent to the Bilingual Education Project.

For further information, please write to:

Bilingual Education Project
Modern Language Centre
The Ontario Institute for Studies
252 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1V6

Appendix F

TABLE 1.4

Summary table of percentage frequencies of opinions of teachers concerning select statements about French Immersion.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Probably Agree	Neutral	Probably Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response/Missing
a. French Immersion programs are not a good idea because they make children in them different from their friends	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	2.1	16.7	75.0	2.1
b. French Immersion programs are not a good idea because they create an elite group.	2.1	2.1	2.1	6.3	0.0	33.3	50.0	4.2
c. The money spent on French Immersion would be better spent on improving instruction in French available to students in all English schools	0.0	2.1	2.1	6.3	2.1	37.5	47.9	2.1
d. The money spent on French Immersion would be better spent on improving instruction in French available to students in French language schools.	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	6.3	31.3	47.9	8.4
e. The money spent on French immersion would be better spent on improving instruction in all subjects throughout the school system.	0.0	0.0	2.1	2.1	2.1	43.8	41.7	8.4
f. Many children come out of French Immersion programs deficient in English language skills.	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	12.5	20.8	54.2	8.4
g. French immersion is the best way for English speaking children to become truly bilingual.	58.3	22.9	4.2	0.0	6.3	2.1	2.1	4.2
h. French immersion makes school more interesting for children.	18.8	29.2	14.6	18.8	6.3	2.1	4.2	6.3
i. The presence of French Immersion in Ontario schools shows Quebec that we are concerned about Canadian Unity.	10.4	14.6	20.8	18.8	14.6	4.2	10.4	6.3
j. A bilingual person is a better educated person.	31.3	16.7	10.4	12.5	4.2	14.6	8.3	2.1

*Note: Variations in row totals from 100% due to round off error

N=48

TABLE 1.10

Percentage Frequencies to Question (teacher survey):

How important would you estimate that each of the following was in parents choosing to enrol their children in French Immersion?

		Very important consideration	Important consideration	Minor consideration	No influence	No Response/Missing
a.	Belief it would give better access to jobs	75	17	4	4	0
b.	Belief it was important to learn another language	60	27	13	0	0
c.	Belief that mastery of second language is an important part of education	40	40	15	2	4*
d.	It was the only way children can get transported to school	0	0	6	92	2
e.	Only way children can eat lunch at school	0	0	0	98	2
f.	Immersion is seen as a form of enrichment	42	42	17	0	0*
g.	French parents who have lost language or culture wish children to regain Francophone identity.	19	35	21	25	0
h.	Parents believe Canada's future depends upon bilingual citizens where there is some ability in both French and English and an awareness and appreciation of the other culture	23	46	21	8	2
i.	Immersion is seen as the first step in the child being multilingual.	6	33	40	15	6
j.	Children's friends were in the program	6	19	50	21	4
k.	Friends of parent had enroled their child in the Immersion program.	10	31	44	13	2
l.	Involvement of parent or student with teacher, principal, superintendent, trustee or consultant who convinced them of the programs merit	2	92	2	0	4
m.	Recommendation of a relative in another community who was involved with Immersion program	4	31	44	15	6
n.	Other (specify) ________________________	2	92	2	0	4

N=48

TABLE 1.12

Percentage of students agreeing to the proposition that:	Atrongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	No Response/Missing
22. I think every student should learn French.	32.2	36.1	18.0	4.7	8.6	.4
23. French Immersion is a form of enrichment in school.	30.5	57.1	4.7	2.6	4.3	.9*
24. Canada's future depends upon bilingual citizens	24.9	43.8	15.0	5.6	10.7	.0
27. I am proud of the fact that I can speak French.	70.8	24.5	1.7	1.3	1.7	.0
28. A bilingual person is a better educated person.	35.6	30.3	18.9	8.2	6.9	.4*
37. French Immersion makes school more interesting for students.	36.5	36.9	12.0	6.0	7.7	.9
41. French Immersion aids in bringing the French and English people together.	38.6	36.9	8.2	5.6	9.4	1.3

N=232